DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 622 UD 024 194

TITLE Equity, Choice and Effective Urban Education: A Focus on Schools. Desegregation in Massachusetts 1984-85 Annual Report.

INSTITUTION Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston. Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunities.

PUB DATE Apr 85

NOTE 202p.; Appendices may not reproduce clearly. For related document, see ED 240 221.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; Case Studies; Cultural Differences; Desegregation Effects; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Trends; *Equal Education; Low Income Groups; Minority Group Children; Parent School Relationship; Public Schools; Racial Composition; Refugees; *School Desegregation; School Districts; *School Effectiveness; *Urban Schools; Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on effective urban schools in the context of desegregation. The introduction takes a retrospective and prospective look at desegregation in terms of: (1) progress since the last report; (2) the changing focus of equal educational opportunity; (3) an agenda for the 1980s; and (4) equity and choice. The second section provides brief notes on the status of desegregation in each Massachusetts school district. The third and fourth sections address refugee needs and vocational issues. The next section provides working descriptions of certain urban elementary, middle, and senior high schools in Massachusetts that are "striving to become educationally effective desegregating schools." These schools, it is stated, have been chosen for profiling because their desegregated-related accomplishments have gone unrecognized outside their local communities; they educate children most "at risk" of being underserved in the educational marketplace; students' academic performances have improved during desegregation; and a distinctive relationship between parents and schools has been developed. The final two sections describe Massachusetts and Federal desegregation requirements, and enrollment trends and patterns. Two lengthy appendices tabulate: (1) October 1984 enrollment by race for schools in selected districts; and (2) October 1978, 1981, and 1983 enrollment by minority percentage and low-income percentage for schools in selected districts. (RDN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED255622

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Glen
Mass. State Dept. of Ed., MA BEEO.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EQUITY, CHOICE AND EFFECTIVE URBAN EDUCATION: A FOCUS ON SCHOOLS

DESEGREGATION IN MASSACHUSETTS 1984-85 ANNUAL REPORT

APRIL 1985

UD024194

MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF EDUCATION

Ms. Mary Ellen Smith, Boston, *Chairperson*
Mrs. Mary C. Wright, Falmouth, *Vice Chairperson*

Mr. Robert A. Farmer, Brookline
Mrs. Anne C. Fox, Needham
Rev. Paul V. Garrity, Malden
Ms. Milca R. Gonzalez, Worcester
Mr. James R. Grande, Hanover
Mr. Howard A. Greis, Holden
Mr. Gregory G. Nadeau, Marblehead
Mrs. Loretta L. Roach, Boston
Mr. Joseph C. Savery, Lee
Mrs. Dorothea A. Zanetti, Wilbraham

Dr. John H. Lawson, *Commissioner of Education, Secretary*

Mr. John B. Duff, *Chancellor*, Board of Regents, Ex Officio

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
Charles L. Glenn, *Director*
Michael Alves, *Project Director*
Judith Taylor
Maureen Wark
Paula T. Willis
Typing coordinated by Ellen Kanakis

Produced by the Bureau of Operational Support
Cecilia DiBella, *Director*
Susan Gardner, *Publications/Communications Coordinator*
Susan M. Ridge, *Typographist*

The Massachusetts Department of Education insures equal employment/educational opportunities/affirmative action regardless of race, color, creed, national origin or sex, in compliance with Title IX, or handicap, in compliance with section 504.

Publication #13988—195—1500—3-85 approved by Daniel D. Carter, *State Purchasing Agent.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

March 28, 1985

TO: Commissioner John H. Lawson

FROM: Charles Glenn, Director

RE: Desegregation in Massachusetts: 1984-85 Annual Report

One of the best-kept secrets in the Commonwealth has been the substantial educational progress made by many urban schools through the desegregation process and with the support of Chapter 636 state funding. Our 1984-85 Report lets some of these schools tell their own story.

Several years ago you directed me to assure that the desegregation which we have by-and-large accomplished results, at the school level, in effective integration and equity. We knew that could be done only by committed principals and teachers, and that our role as a state agency would be to encourage, advise, and support.

The generally positive tone of the pages which follow could give a misleading impression that all equity issues have been resolved, or that change in the interest of fairness to minority students can be accomplished painlessly. As you know, behind each of the "success stories" lies an initial struggle to place equity and desegregation at the top of the agenda for school systems and schools. Mixed with our satisfaction over the progress which has been made is a vivid awareness that much remains to be done.

Perhaps the crucial factor in creating a collaborative spirit has been the leadership given by a few urban superintendents when faced with the need to desegregate and to alter school system practices in the interest of equity. They provided an example not only to their own school systems but to others as well.

Of the several hundred principals who have served desegregated schools, many gave outstanding leadership, while some have been impediments to achieving real integration. No challenge which a principal can face puts leadership ability and sensitivity so clearly to the test as does desegregation, and those who could not meet the test have in some cases been given other assignments. We can say truthfully that those who have risen to the challenge are some of the outstanding educators in Massachusetts.

Our Annual Report last year focused on school systems, and this year we focus on schools. Next year we plan to present some of the classrooms where integration is taking place, and to let some outstanding teachers tell their stories. That, after all, will be the real test of our efforts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Looking Back, Looking Ahead	1
Desegregation Activities 1984-1985	14
Needs of Refugee Students	20
Springfield & Boston: Vocational Issues	23
A Sampling of Effective Desegregated Schools	31
Boston	33
Cambridge	59
Holyoke	68
Lowell	75
Medford	82
Springfield	85
Worcester	91
Massachusetts and Federal Requirements	102
Enrollment Trends and Patterns	107
Appendices:	
October 1984 enrollment by race for schools in selected districts	117
October 1978, 1981 and 1983 enrollment by percent minority and percent low-income for schools in selected districts	153
Acknowledgements	194

Looking Back, Looking Ahead

Charles L. Glenn, Director

Since the Last Report

Our last report on Desegregation in Massachusetts (February 1984) focused on the progress in education which has accompanied desegregation progress in a number of cities in Massachusetts.

We described the assessment of integration as reflected in the friendships and classroom behavior of students in Springfield. This assessment, and the strategies to improve integration which have developed out of it, have been used and gradually perfected in Springfield since 1978-79, and this year a number of other cities have begun to use the same approach to completing the desegregation process, with Springfield's assistance.

We described the use of parent surveys, in Worcester and in Lowell, as a means of providing information about the diverse goals which parents have for the education of their children, so that schools can develop distinctive "flavors" and thus attract desegregated enrollments on a voluntary basis. We stressed the importance, from an equity perspective, of avoiding the creation of "elite" magnet admission policies; schools can be different (because students are not all the same) without relegating other schools to second-class status. Other cities, including Boston, are drawing upon this experience with educational diversity as they continue their own desegregation efforts.

We described the process of developing a desegregation plan for Lawrence, which was reaching a critical phase as the last report was prepared. A few months later a comprehensive plan was adopted and then approved by the Board. The fact that Implementation began smoothly and on schedule this Fall, unaffected by community disorders a month before, is a tribute to the careful process of parent and staff involvement out of which the plan developed. One of the new K-8 schools upon which full implementation depends is under construction, and ground was broken for the other on March 26.

We described the substantial educational progress which has occurred in Holyoke in response to the crisis of developing and implementing a comprehensive desegregation plan. The report included an extended statement by the superintendent, beginning,

> Since Holyoke desegregated its elementary schools it has become apparent that the effects of school integration will be pervasive, positive and far reaching.

Over the past year it has been the goal of the desegregating school systems, and of our office, to assure that desegregation would be a powerful impetus to school improvement in each community. After all, the majority of poor children, of minority children, of limited-English-speaking children in the Commonwealth live in these cities with desegregation plans. Any strategy for school improvement or for "educational excellence" which does not make these communities a priority, and does not build upon what they have learned about meeting the needs of the most vulnerable students, would be sadly deficient from the perspective of equal educational opportunity.

The Changing Focus of Equal Educational Opportunity

In the fifteen years that this bureau has been seeking to live up to its title--which is, after all, the mission of the whole Department of Education and not of one small part of it--the focus of our educational equity efforts has changed repeatedly. These changes have not always been uncontroversial, since those whose focus is on a single issue would like to see it remain perpetually at the center of the stage. We have tried to allay these concerns as time and again an issue which was first addressed in EEO has become diffused throughout the Department, has become "everybody's business."

The danger with such diffusion, of course, is that important issues, because they belong to everybody, will actually belong to nobody. Thus it has been important that Deputy Commissioner Fred Williams has been willing to serve as a very active chairperson of the Department-wide Civil Rights Task Force, which includes representatives of each Division and Regional Center. This has freed me, as EEO director, to concentrate on the new issues which need to be nursed along until, like others before them, they can simply be addressed in the regular operations of the Department.

It may be interesting--or nostalgic--to review some of the issues which at one point or another, have been "nursed" in this way by EEO. In the early 1970s we worked, of course, on enforcement of the Racial Imbalance Law in Boston, New Bedford, and Springfield, with plans implemented in all three by mid-decade. Although I had been appointed to

revive a languishing effort in this area of major concern to the Board, there were a number of other issues which seemed too important to overlook. We studied and issued a report on inequities in school finance; we worked on guidelines for parent involvement for various program areas of the Department; we bore responsibility for bilingual education in the months before that bureau was established; we gave special attention to the problem of Hispanic children who were not in school or, if in school, were classified as retarded because of their problems with English; we published guidelines and resource materials on multicultural education and on the employment of para-professional staff as a bridge between schools and low income communities; we focused attention on tracking practices which tended to direct minority students away from both academic and vocational courses.

After the adoption of Chapter 622, we developed recommendations and then regulations for their implementation. Talented new staff were hired, and they provided on-site assistance and conducted literally hundreds if not thousands of workshops and consultations on sex equity and race/national origin equity across the Commonwealth. Resource centers were established in each regional center, and regional 622 advisory committees gave a focus to the efforts of citizens and educators. A series of publications, brochures, a widely-distributed poster in three versions (English, Portuguese, Spanish), and video presentations helped to create a new awareness of the requirements of fairness in education. Vocational education was a special focus, in view of the fifty or more single-sex vocational schools in Massachusetts when we began, and a strategy of requiring admission plans and enrollment goals for schools with selective admissions produced moderately satisfactory results.

The amendment of the Racial Imbalance Law (formerly Chapter 641, now Chapter 636) in 1974 forced us to divert much of our attention to creating procedures and criteria for management of an unparalleled program of state assistance to desegregating schools. Aside from continuing and expanding the Metco Program in forty suburban communities, Chapter 636 created "Equal Education Improvement Funds" for each desegregating community ($6 million the first year) and a program to support magnet schools and part-time magnet programs ($3 million the first year). These funds could be used to support such innovations as school/university partnerships and the involvement of cultural agencies--museums, theatre companies, music and dance associations--in strengthening urban schools and in providing alternative educational experiences.

Suddenly we were operating almost a division, with more than forty staff and more than ninety specific objectives. Our capacity to identify the new equity issues and to work with others to develop effective responses was largely lost. Only by reorganizing to place many programs and staff elsewhere in the Department has it been possible for EEO to resume its original function of direct support to the Commissioner in his equity responsibilities.

An Agenda for The 1980s

At the risk of oversimplification, it is possible to say that the over-riding equity agenda in education during the 1970s had to do with <u>where</u> students were educated, and that of the 1980s with <u>how</u> they are educated.

In 1970, linguistic minority students and female students were excluded, by local policy and practices, from many educational opportunities and programs and even schools, while Black students were heavily concentrated in relatively few--and generally inferior--schools. The equity agenda of the next decade was to break down barriers and change enrollment patterns in such a way that, so far as possible, neither schools nor programs would be readily identifiable by race, by sex, or by national origin.

To a substantial extent--though of course not to our full satisfaction--that agenda has been carried out. Formal barriers have been removed, and informal ones at least are lower. There has been a massive shift in attitudes on the part of school staff, and of aspirations on the part of female and to some extent of minority students. While more remains to be done, efforts to promote access can now legitimately take second place to a challenge growing out of the very success of such efforts in the past. After all, the final test of our work is not the satisfaction of an abstract sense of justice but the education which students receive. Even increasing the enrollment of Black and Hispanic students in Boston Latin School, as we have pointed out in the Court-ordered monitoring reports, is a mixed benefit if a high proportion of them leave the school again because of inadequate preparation and support.

The primary equity agenda of the 1980s, in Massachusetts, is to assure that schools--and especially urban schools--are <u>effective</u> for the most vulnerable students. Effectiveness of course includes teaching basic skills very well, but it also includes developing higher-order skills, self-respect, and an appreciation of the racial and cultural diversity of our society. Effective urban schools, the late Ron Edmonds used to say, are the best schools of all; we agree, convinced that such schools not only respond to needs which are uncommonly challenging, but also call upon human and community resources which are uncommonly rich.

We agree also with Secretary of Education William Bennett, that the poor and minority students about whom EEO is especially concerned are those most in need of educational excellence. These are the students who will be given no second chance because of the position and resources of their parents, the students for whom a first-rate education at the elementary and the secondary level will make all the difference.

Our Annual Report for 1984-85 focuses on effective urban schools. Michael Alves and Paula Willis worked with desegregating systems to identify schools which are desegregated, enroll an above-average proportion of low-income children for their districts, are making significant educational progress, and have received little attention or publicity in the past. Staff of each school were invited to tell us about some of the elements of their success. These are not "super schools," nor are they schools without continuing problems, but they are schools where staff and parents are working together to improve education. We believe they deserve attention and credit; they are what our efforts, in EEO, are all about.

But we are not ready to "declare a victory and get out" of the struggle for educational equity. Real issues remain, and indeed in some respects we have been losing ground over the past fifteen years. Our priority concerns at mid-decade include:

- **Minority and Especially Hispanic Secondary Students**

  Several years ago we identified this as a civil rights priority group in the Operational Plan, but we are not satisfied with the progress which we have made. The secondary desegregation plans in Boston and Springfield seek to address vocational and college-preparatory opportunities, and to do so in light of sex equity as well as of race and national origin equity, but progress in implementing them has been less than hoped-for when we negotiated them. This Report includes a preliminary discussion, by Judith Taylor, of the needs in those communities; other issues include access to vocational opportunities in Chelsea (Northeast Met), Holyoke, and Worcester, and the tremendous challenges faced by Lawrence and other communities with large Hispanic enrollments.

  Last year's Report pointed out the rapid growth of Hispanic enrollment in high schools in Massachusetts, as a result of a changing demographic profile of the Hispanic community and of some progress in retaining students in school. We pointed to an urgent need to provide

assistance to nine high schools which had increased their Hispanic enrollment by more than 100 students between 1978 and 1982. This need remains and has intensified. See page 109.

The response required is not exclusively or even primarily "bilingual education," since for many of the students Spanish is not the primary language, but an effective response will have to include Spanish-speaking staff as well as strong programs to improve English skills even for students for whom it is the primary language.

A newly-formed consortium of twelve desegregating school systems has begun to work together, and with the Department, to find better ways to meet the complex needs of urban secondary students. The consortium held a working session in Lawrence, last Fall, on approaches to reducing the dropout rate, and another in Holyoke, this Winter, on "two-way" bilingual education in the context of desegregation. Shared experiences and the new energy which can come from knowing that others are facing the same challenges make such meetings an important part of addressing our equity concerns.

Much more needs to be done. The Board recently appointed an exceptionally-qualified person to join the EEO staff, and when she starts work her first priority will be to work with the desegregating systems and our regional centers to make education more effective for Hispanic secondary students.

- **Refugee and Other Immigrant Students**

Our last Report noted the rapid growth of Asian enrollment in Lowell and other communities, and the needs of refugee students from Southeast Asia, Haiti and Latin America have posed unexpected challenges to urban systems already dealing with massive educational and social needs. See below, pages 111-114.

Massachusetts has a checkered history of welcoming and educating newcomers. In 1838, for example, 282 citizens of Sutton and 325 citizens of Milbury petitioned Congress to investigate whether foreign immigration did not represent a Catholic conspiracy against the liberties of the American people. On the other hand, education authorities in Lowell at the same period arranged to meet the educational needs of immigrants (who

were avoiding the public schools) by adopting two parochial schools into the public system, under an agreement that the teachers would be Catholic but the schools would follow the same curriculum and use the same books as other Lowell schools--an arrangement highly approved by Horace Mann.

The same suspicion and rejection of newcomers by some, and sensitivity to their needs and values by others, has characterized Massachusetts over the years. In 1914 a legislative Commission on Immigration ctiticised the practice, in some schools, of placing newly-arrived immigrant children in "special" classes with "backward and subnormal children for whom quite different methods are needed, and a grave injustice is thus done to both groups." The Commission pointed out that "all teaching must be carefully adapted to the background of each child's life. To know this background the teachers must study the modifications of the old-world customs and traditions as they are found in Boston, New Bedford and Springfield. They must know the parents as well as the children; their past as well as their present." The practice of putting newcomers in "special" classes was all too common only a decade ago, while the advice about understanding the family and cultural background of children is needed nearly as much today as it was seventy years ago.

The classic discussion of the education of immigrants was published by Boston Superintendent Frank V. Thompson in 1920. Thompson was a critic of "Americanization" efforts which were based on economic exploitation or on chauvinism: "It must be confessed that in spite of our official pride in our democratic institutions and our conditions of freedom and opportunity for the oppressed, we have needed gross and utilitarian incentives like those of fear, 'safety first,' and 'it pays,' to start us on the paths of justice and humanity. . . . we will be concerned that [the immigrant] may be able to share in our citizenship, learn our ideals, contribute his share to the thinking and action of the nation."

Thompson had special praise for the efforts of Lawrence at the Oliver School--a school still in use, and once again the scene of positive developments--to teach civics in a way which would relate the children of immigrants to the community and to the higher values of democracy. "The school that teaches the

Principles of democracy should be itself a democracy. The child learns how to be a good citizen by being a good citizen. The life of the school should give free play to common interest and common action for the common good. The school must train in initiative, in self-control, in respect for liberty under law."

This voice from the past reminds us that our responsibility to the children who are newcomers among us is far more than just to teach them English as quickly and as well as possible, though of course we must do that. Public schools are for many of them the first intensive exposure to what our society is all about and what will be expected of them as citizens. If we reduce their education to a narrow technical affair, if we act as though, because the parents are poor and speak little English, it is unnecessary to treat them and their children with respect and to share with them our highest values, we are failing in our educational mission.

Maureen Wark, who is working with a number of the school systems with large concentrations of recent refugees and immigrants, has prepared a section of the present Report which reviews current issues and anticipated developments. Her recommendations deserve careful attention. (See pages 20-22.)

- **Respect for Diverse Beliefs and Values**

Frank Thompson had the sense to recognize, also, the limits of what education can--or should--hope to accomplish. "It is too much to expect that we can affect presently or in the discernible future a national homegeneity. We must attempt the possible--namely, a certain degree of unity in our heterogeneity. This unity must be an appreciation of the duties of the common citizenship which we all share. While our citizens will differ profoundly in many ways, there should be certain common elements such as love of country, adherence to our institutions, and devotion to the principle of democracy. All our schools, public and private, should emphasize these elements of unity while teaching respect for the differences of race and religion which characterize our population."

Not all public educators, in 1920 or since, have been as sensitive to the fact that we are a pluralistic society which both protects and

respects the beliefs of its people. Conflicts over the way that we respond to this pluralism helped to create and sustain thousands of alternatives to public schools, and we are experiencing a second wave of non-public school founding today. Thus in recent years enrollment in non-public schools in Massachusetts has increased, while our public school enrollment continues to decline. Studies show that academic standards are an important factor in this trend, but equally important are the values which non-public schools are believed to teach.

From around the country there has been a growing level of conflict within public education, as well, over what we teach or do not teach with respect to values, beliefs, and behavior. Several national studies have found that this ranks ahead of academic performance as a concern of public school parents.

Why is this an equity concern? In part, of course, because the desegregation process makes us especially sensitive to the general satisfaction and commitment which parents feel toward public schools, and to the alternatives available. In Lawrence, for example, the desegregation planning worked closely with clergy and with non-public schools. But also because Massachusetts law recognizes a right not to be discriminated against on the basis of religion in exact parallel to the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of race, sex and national origin (Chapter 622).

If a child is not able to attend a public school because what is taught in that school is offensive to the religious beliefs of his or her family, we have a situation in some respects parallel to that created by barriers based upon national origin and the language spoken at home. Just as exclusion on the basis of race, and of sex, and of national origin have each posed different problems and called for different solutions, so that on the basis of religion poses problems--closely related to the First Amendment, of course--which will require hard work and creativity by lawyers, equity specialists, and school officials.

This issue has not become as heated in Massachusetts as in many parts of the country, and we trust that it will not. If even one child is experiencing exclusion on the basis of

religion, however, it is our responsibility to work toward a sensitive remedy. The law we implement and our responsibility as educators demand no less.

It may well be that a part of the solution will be found in an increased diversity of public schools, to reflect and respect the diversity of our people, keeping always in mind Frank Thompson's concern that we assure that all schools teach those common convictions upon which our society and democracy depend.

Equity and Choice

One of our primary objectives over the past year has been to yoke together two words which have traditionally worked against each other: "equity" and "choice." For good reasons, those concerned with educational equity, since Horace Mann, have been dubious about the effects of choice. By limiting choice, however, we have failed to take advantage of the energies and commitment which it can elicit and we have tried to force schools into a single mold which can never meet the diverse needs of students. By limiting choice we have also created new inequities, as those who could afford alternatives to public education simply chose not to enroll their children. In a free society, in fact, choice cannot be eliminated, except for the poor.

Each of our desegregation plans in Massachusetts has tried to come to terms with the fact that parents will choose in any case by seeking to encourage and guide such choices to promote equity and integration. As we have worked with these transfer policies and voluntary options, it has become increasingly clear that choice can do much to promote equity. It does so by creating conditions which encourage schools to become more effective, it does so by allowing schools to specialize and thus to meet the needs of some students very well rather than all students at a level of minimum adequacy, and it does so by increasing the influence of parents over the education of their children in a way which is largely conflict-free. We have become excited about the potential of choice for public education.

Others around the country share this conviction that increased choice can help to strengthen public education, and without a sacrifice of equity in any respect. Governor Lamar Alexander of Tennessee has called choice a major challenge for public education, and Governor Rudy Perpich of Minnesota has proposed to allow students in the eleventh and twelfth grades to attend public schools across district lines. While these programs would require legislative action we already have in Massachusetts legal authority and

generous funding for parent choice. More than three thousand students from Boston and Springfield attend suburban schools in a program which has proved itself over more than fifteen years, while some thirty thousand students in our cities attend schools on the basis of choice rather than district lines. What is missing is a program under which suburban students would be encouraged to attend urban schools and take advantage of the resources and diversity which a city offers; we have a successful pilot of such a program some years ago until it foundered in the administrative confusion of the host (Boston) system.

In February of this year I was invited to Minnesota to advise the Governor's Task Force on Open Enrollment on the development of the proposed state-wide system of choice among public high schools. Below are some of my remarks about what we have learned here in Massachusetts:

> Choice is important to public education because choice is important to the public. It is perhaps the key element of that modernization of consciousness which is placing all of our institutions under critical strains. A public which can choose its brand of toilet paper and its long distance phone connection expects to choose in the infinitely more important area of schooling for its children. Generic brand education does not satisfy sophisticated consumers of goods and services. The public schools which survive as attractive to those parents who have any alternatives will be those which dare to be diverse, to be responsive, to concentrate on satisfying some parents very much. This is possible only if they are free not to please every parent. The old defensive posture, hunkering down and trying to avoid offending anyone at the expense of flavor, of creativity, of vital energy is a recipe for boring and irrelevant education and, eventually, for catastrophe. . . .
>
> I've suggested that, far from being a threat to the enterprise of public education, the extension of school choice can help to realize the promise of the common school of the Republic, can permit us to respond to the diversity of beliefs about how children should be educated, and can place us in a competitive posture which is essential to our long-term prosperity. . . .

It's important to be very clear about what our objectives are in equity and in desegregation. The essence of equity is not to seek to make every child the same or even to treat every child in precisely the same way but rather to provide the most effective possible education to every child, based entirely upon needs and abilities and not at all upon race or national origin or what Horace Mann would have called "inherited privilege." A good case can be made, in fact, that the individualized educational plans which we develop for students with special needs are a model for how we would plan and provide services for every child under a system of real equal educational opportunity. Standardization leads to unequal opportunity, as more and more children fail to "fit" the standard. Thus the diversification of offerings, the availability of expanded choice, can increase the likelihood that some educational setting will be available to meet the needs of every child.

When I speak of needs in this context I mean not only the special environments and support services which we have sought to provide for so-called "special needs students," but also the more subtle characteristics of school climate and philosophy and sense of direction. I am suggesting that whether parents feel that a school is congruent with their own beliefs and attitudes, as well as their aspirations for their children, has much to do with whether the children are successful; if this is true (and much research suggests it is) then it is particularly important with respect to those poor and minority students whose success in school is most in question. . . .

What I have been suggesting is that choice is a powerful force for educational change as well as for equity, but that it should be backed up by ongoing oversight, adjustment, redirection as well as by support for the students involved. . . .

The essence of desegregation is not, we need to remember, to require that a particular white child attend a particular school with a particular Black or Hispanic child, although we often act as though we had to

assure that at any cost. The essence of it is to assure that minority children attend schools which are not racially isolated and in which integration is a positive goal which everyone--staff, parents, students--is working toward. There are schools which I would not want to put a minority child into. By making it rewarding for a school to become a magnet school, and by supporting a process of differentiation and change, it is possible to go beyond passive receptivity to minority children, or to white children, and make attracting, welcoming and serving them the highest mission of everyone in the school.

That is the power of choice. Shouldn't we be seeking the same welcoming, supportive, challenging environment for every student?

Desegregation Activities

by Charles L. Glenn

BOSTON

The first desegregation plans in Boston involved new school construction, and were negotiated with the State during the period 1965-1970. The Trotter School opened as a magnet school in 1969, and the new Lee and Marshall Schools opened as "fringe area" schools intended to draw from wide, racially-mixed attendance areas in 1971. Failure of the School Committee to keep its commitments to the State Board in 1971 led to enforcement action, seeking (a) control of voluntary transfers to prevent enhancement of segregation; (b) a plan for secondary districts to increase integration, and (c) short-term measures to assure that new facilities were desegregated. Litigation in state courts ensured, and resulted in court-ordered development of a "Short-term Racial Balance Plan" by the State in March 1973. This plan was implemented in September 1974, after the Supreme Judicial Court ruled that the School Committee must proceed. Meanwhile, the Federal District Court found that Boston had violated the constitutional rights of minority students, and ordered the State plan as an immediate remedy. Many schools were thus desegregated.

In May 1975 Judge W. Arthur Garrity ordered a completely revised student assignment plan which went considerably beyond that ordered by the Board, both as to the number of schools and students involved and also as to staff and program issues. It is this plan, first implemented in September 1975, which remains in effect today.

The Department of Education has monitored desegregation compliance in Boston closely for the past two years on behalf of the Federal District Court. The semi-annual reports, although long and very detailed, reach essentially two conclusions about Boston efforts to complete the desegregation process:

a) assignments, transfers and other procedures appear to be implemented in close compliance with the Court's requirements;

b) active efforts at the school and district levels to achieve full desegregation through encouraging parents to enroll their children in desegregated schools have been few and largely ineffectual.

Although the Court has permitted a wide range of voluntary measures, the perception in the School Department and this among parents is that the Desegregation Plan is rigid and unable to accommodate legitimate interests and concerns. As a result, the process of desegregation has not, by and large, elicited positive energies and educational improvements as in other desegregating systems in Massachusetts. The Court pointed out, on February 20, 1985 that

> the school defendants must take affirmative action to desegregate, i.e., steps beyond mere compliance with court orders.

In December and January the School Committee made a number of proposals for modifications in the student assignment plan; most of these were approved by the Court after extensive discussion and filings by the various parties. Several of the modifications which were approved create new opportunities for parent/student choice and thus for initiative and diversity in schools. They are the first major modifications in the plan in a number of years.

The success of the school system in implementing these new measures over the next few months will do much to determine whether desegregation in Boston will become as positive from the perspective of parent choice and satisfaction as has desegregation in other Massachusetts cities.

BROCKTON

Brockton has a small but growing minority population. The first steps toward desegregation were taken in 1983-84, when Chapter 636 funds were granted for a magnet program at the Arnone School and a planning process began. This process has continued in 1984-85, building community support and identifying equity issues which can be addressed by a comprehensive plan for equal opportunity and integration.

CAMBRIDGE

The process of desegregation in Cambridge took place in a series of annual steps which were described in our 1983 Annual Report. The present method of making student assignments has attracted wide attention. Each parent registering a child for grades K-8 is asked to make several school choices, on the basis of extensive information provided. Assignments then seek to satisfy these choices

while taking desegregation carefully into account. A full description of this process and its results by Michael Alves is found in the first issue of Equity and Choice (Fall, 1984).

FALL RIVER

Although Fall River has a low proportion of minority students, the system is eligible to participate in desegregation activities because of an amendment of the Racial Imbalance Law which makes it possible to count students of Portuguese and French-Canadian ancestry as "minority" for the purpose of funding magnet schools. This provision will be used for the first time, on a pilot basis, in Fall River. On March 6th, on the recommendation of Superintendent Correiro, the School Committee voted to submit a proposal "to reduce and progressively eliminate minority isolation, and to provide equal educational improvement system-wide in the Fall River Public Schools."

In discussions with the superintendent, we have suggested that the focus of the initial planning process be upon assessing the needs of immigrant children whose first language is Portuguese.

HOLYOKE

Holyoke implemented a comprehensive desegregation plan in September 1981. Present efforts include a substantial increase in the number of students who attend magnet schools on a voluntary basis.

LAWRENCE

The major new desegregation implementation in 1984-85 has been in Lawrence, which adopted a comprehensive plan last Spring. The first stages of this plan went into effect this September, after careful preparation which showed imagination and sensitivity to the needs of the children and their parents. In a mid-year report from the Parent Information Center we are told that "early and subjective estimations of the operation of the desegregation plan seem to sugget the plan's efficacy in maintaining stability for students and in effectively accommodating increased minority enrollment without diminishing desegregative gains. In all, as we feel this report will point out, it would appear that operationally, educationally and statistically the desegregation of the public schools has been successful."

It is encouraging that those closest to actual implementation are so positive, though of course the Bureau

will assess progress through school visits and enrollment and transfer statistics. Desegregation to date has been concentrated on one of the three zones into which the city was divided (each including portions of North and South Lawrence), since new facilities are under construction in the other two zones. In addition, newly-enrolled students have been assigned in accordance with the assignments which they will have when the plan is fully implemented, to avoid a second move.

Problems have been identified with transportation and student absenteeism in two instances, and steps have been undertaken to resolve them.

LOWELL

The desegregation plan developed by the Lowell Public Schools relies largely (though not exclusively) upon voluntary transfers to magnet schools. Three schools were implemented in the first phase, and have been a marked success, but the four schools in the second phase have not achieved their expected results. More needs to be done locally, with State assistance, to complete the desegregation process.

LYNN

A single magnet school has operated in Lynn for a number of years, but now there is the prospect of a broader approach to the issues of racial isolation and equal opportunity in that community. The Bureau is working with the superintendent to assure that the comprehensive planning now taking place in Lynn takes full account--as required by law--of its implications for desegregation.

MEDFORD

Several years ago Medford went through a planning process to up-date a racial balance plan which had been adopted in the late 1980s. The original plan called for one magnet school, but the system now operates a K-8 magnet complex in two facilities.

NEW BEDFORD

The desegregation efforts of a decade ago in New Bedford--efforts which brought the Board of Education to the brink of enforcement action--have remained largely effective despite changing populations, but Superintendent Nanopoulos has recently expressed an interest in the development of several magnet school options in addition.

SPRINGFIELD

Springfield is generally considered a major "success story" of desegregation, with little white flight or community tension, and with significant educational progress occurring in conjunction with desegregation. Nevertheless, there are several "continuing issues."

1. High Schools

The four high schools in Springfield enroll students citywide on the basis of programmatic themes: Classical, Technical, Commerce, and Vocational. In recent years several of these schools have grown increasingly identifiable by race and sex. Racial isolation has become a problem particularly at Technical, where white enrollment has dropped from 615 in 1978 to 141 in 1984. See the discussion in our section on "Vocational Issues."

In May 1982 the School Committee adopted a plan, subsequently approved by the Board, to achieve "balance" in race and gender. While full implementation will require completion of a new facility in which Classical and Technical will be combined, and an expansion of Putnam, Springfield is committed to interim measures to encourage enrollment with a desegregative impact. It is also a matter of great importance to develop a program for the new facility which will not result in two schools, one white and one minority, operating within the same building.

2. Isolation of Hispanic Students

The 1973 "Six District Plan" dealt exclusively with the desegregation of "non-white" students, but the North End schools which most Hispanic students then attended were unaffected by the implementation of the Plan in September 1974. The Board ordered the school system to develop a further plan which would reduce the isolation of Hispanic students, expressing concern that continuing isolation of Hispanics might constitute a violation of rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment, held to cover Hispanics since the Keyes (Denver) decision of 1970. Several appeals to the Supreme Judicial Court resulted in confirmation of the Board's right and duty to act on this constitutional basis.

In August 1975 the Board ordered Springfield to implement a variety of measures to reduce Hispanic isolation, including some bearing upon the use of the just-opening New North School, others involving the closing of several old facilities and the reassignment of their largely Hispanic population, and yet others involving the development of "magnet" measures to complete the desegregation of Hispanic students.

This year Springfield has 1,142 students enrolled voluntarily in nine elementary and two junior high schools which also serve geographical attendance areas.

Brightwood (72% Hispanic) and Lincoln (80%) elementary schools and Chestnut Street Junior High School (75%) are, with two schools in Lawrence which will soon be desegregated, the only schools in Massachusetts over 70% Hispanic.

These schools will remain a priority in 1985, and Springfield will be encouraged not only to continue its vigorous implementation of the measures outlined above but also to consider approaches which have proved effective in other systems.

WORCESTER

The Worcester desegregation plan is a mixture of redistricting, program shifts, and extensive use of voluntary transfers to magnet schools. While two schools continue to show fairly high minority enrollments, there are measures in place to deal with this situation over the next several years.

Worcester has made more use than have other Massachusetts systems of parent surveys to create a network of "schools of choice." There is now considerable interest in expanding the desegregation effort to the intermediate and high schools, through developing additional options within the context of present schools.

SUMMARY

The brief notes above do not attempt an account of the status and history of desegregation in each of the school systems, since the focus of the 1984-85 Report is on educational improvements at the school level. A few aspects of the Department's current desegregation activities have been noted; a more extensive discussion of the background in each of the communities is available in the February 1984 Report.

Refugee Needs

by Maureen M. Wark

The Refugee student population in the state has increased rapidly in the past four years. The greatest increase has been in the number of Southeast Asians, that is Cambodian, Laotian and Vietnamese refugees. During the past two years the number of Cambodian students has shown the largest growth. Prior to that the Vietnamese had been the fastest growing refugee population. See pages 111-114.

Originally most of these refugees were settled in Boston. The public schools in Boston have provided bilingual education programs and staff for the past four years with some degree of success. The smaller cities of Suffolk and Middlesex counties that have had increasing numbers of refugee students enter their school systems during the past two or three years have greater difficulty in finding staff members who speak the native language for bilingual classrooms and to provide support services. The Western, Central and Southeastern counties have had the greatest difficulty finding staff. Revere has made progress this past year and Chelsea and Somerville have hired some of the needed native language staff to meet the needs of their refugee populations.

That more and more Cambodian speaking students enrolled in school systems during this year when their budgets and classroom space were already tightly allocated has cause serious difficulties for local school systems in meeting minimal standards of state TBE laws. Lowell has been the school system most seriously impacted during this past school year.

Northeast Regional Office and Central Office staff informed the Superintendent of Lowell in January of this year that needed nineteen Khymer speaking teachers and ESL teachers were needed to bring the school system into minimal compliance with Chapter 71A for the present Cambodian student populations. This has been almost impossible to accomplish with funds from an already over-extended local budget. The Bureau was able to identify $23,000 of additional funds (approved by the Board in March) for Lowell. We have helped the Superintendent to apply for additional Federal Refugee Impact funds, with the

cooperation of the Massachusetts Office for Refugee Resettlement. We feel that Lowell has an emergency situation at this time. They have hired four Southeast Asian staff members with federal Title VII funds, and four Cambodian teachers out of local funds. They have transferred some ESL teachers to the bilingual programs for Cambodian students but this is not half of the staff needed.

Another severe problem is the shortage of classroom space available. The situation at Lowell High School is particularly difficult; they have not had a bilingual program there for the past four years, with over 202 Cambodian students presently enrolled. Some of these students have not been able to earn enough credits to graduate because their math, science, and history classes were only taught in English and the students could not function well enough in English to master the content. Students cannot meet graduation requirements, then, through no fault of their own but because the school system did not provide a TBE program as required by law.

There are other cities and towns in the state that are trying to meet the needs of the SEA refugee populations which now amount to more than 20 students of one language group. These school systems are Fall River, Springfield, Somerville, Lawrence, Quincy, Newton, Waltham, Malden, and Worcester. Many school systems have less than 20 students and are trying to serve this population with an ESL program.

The Massachusetts Office for Refugee Resettlement has discussed the proposed refugee resettlement plan for the next school year. They recommend that 100 individuals, of whom 32 are expected to be school-age children, be settled in the New Bedford/Fall River area, and 200 individuals, of whom 64 are expected to be school-age children, be settled in the Springfield/Holyoke area. Department staff have discussed the impact this proposed resettlement of Cambodian students could have during the next school year on the involved school systems and have offered technical assistance to the Transitional Bilingual Directors of these districts.

One of the difficulties felt by school districts in the past has been the lack of advance warning when a number of refugees were to be resettled in a city or town. EEO staff have been meeting with members of resettlement agencies, staff of the Massachusetts Office for Refugee Resettlement, and the Governor's Advisory Committee for Refugee Resettlement to improve communication.

No one can predict the number of refugee families who will move from one city or town to another within the state or across state lines. For example, the TBE staff in Revere believe that 50% of the Cambodian students that enrolled in

their school system during the 1984-1985 school year had been previously resettled in another city or town by an agency. The families then choose to move to Revere for many reasons, some of which are reuniting families or friends, availability of housing or jobs, the establishment of a Temple or Church, or racist or threatening treatment they were subjected to in the city or town where they were originally placed.

Most of the Federal Refugee Impact funds available to local school districts are based upon the number of Refugee students in a school system in the spring of the previous school year. The major resettlement activities occur from October 1 to June 30 based on the Federal Funding Year. This timing leaves most school districts with inadequate funds during the next school year to meet the needs of incoming students during their first crucial year of enrollment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Continued and improved communication from the resettlement agencies and the Massachusetts Office for Refugee Resettlement through the Massachusetts Department of Education to the Local School Districts.

Increased technical assistance to local school districts to help them provide effective bilingual programs and improved bilingual curriculum and to hire and obtain certification for Native Language staff members.

A major funding increase by the state to local school districts during the school year if a large number of refugee students enroll in the school system after local budgets have been finalized, since federal funds are inadequate to meet these student needs.

Funds to assist local school districts to provide the Special Education services, e.g., assessments, tests, and evaluations in native language.

Vocational Issues

by Judith C. Taylor

Springfield Overview

At present there are four thematic high schools in Springfield, three of which are vocationally oriented--Commerce, Technical and Putnam Vocational High Schools; Classical High School is college preparatory. For some time, Commerce and Technical have overenrolled minority students and Classical and Putnam Vocational have underenrolled them. In 1978, Commerce's minority enrollment was 60%, 14 percentage points higher than the district average; in 1984 it was 66%, 11 points higher than the district average. Technical's minority enrollment was 52% in 1978 (6 points higher than the district average); in 1984 it was 83% (28 points higher than the district average). In contrast, Classical's minority enrollment was 17% in 1978 (28 points below the district average); in 1984 it was 24% (21 points below the district average). At Putnam, the minority percentage was 33% (12 points below the district average); in 1984 it was 46% (9 points below the district average).

However, Springfield is near completion of a high school construction/reorganization program. A new combined school will replace Classical and Technical, eliminating the two schools whose enrollments are most disproportionate. A new wing at Putnam will add modern facilities and enable the school to accommodate more students. Renovations and curriculum revision will make significant improvements at Commerce.

Planning for Increased Minority Access to Vocational Education

In cooperation with the Department of Education Springfield has developed two related plans for improving the quality of, and minority access to, vocational education. First was the Admissions Plan, developed in 1981 in response to a statewide Departmental requirement. The plan centralized authority for recruiting (the Occupational Education Director is responsible), described the resources (both staff and materials) that would be committed to recruiting, the activities that would be undertaken and how they would

be coordinated. Federal vocational education funds have been used for initial support of certain components of the Admissions Plan.

Then, in 1982, the State Board of Education approved a long-range secondary component of the Springfield Desegregation Plan, developed by Springfield staff, which had been used as (among other things) a vehicle for comprehensive planning for vocational education in the city, including recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups. Chapter 636 funds have been used to develop and implement the vocational education components.

Putnam Vocational High School

Enrollment Patterns

Statistically speaking, Putnam has been something of an elite school in the Springfield system. Since 1978 its minority enrollment has been 12-14 percentage points below the system average, and its low income enrollment has been 16 or more points below the system average. From a statewide perspective, however, Putnam (together with the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center in Boston) enrolls a far higher percentage of minority students than the other vocational high schools in the Commonwealth.

Application/Acceptance Patterns

Putnam has also been unable to accept all the students who have applied. In the fall of 1984, for example, the school only had room for 614 of the 776 students who had applied (or, 20% of the applicants could not be accommodated).

The current acceptance patterns at Putnam will not have the effect of bringing the proportion of minorities closer to the system average. For example, 46% of the new students accepted for the fall of 1984 were minority, exactly the same proportion of overall minority enrollment in the school in 1984. Statistically, that is because the school accepted approximately the same proportions of its white and minority applicants (and the proportion of minorities in the school cannot increase until a relatively higher proportion of minorities than whites is accepted for entry, over a period of years).

Recruitment to Putnam Vocational

Network of Special Guidance Counselors

A special guidance counselor responsible for career education/awareness has been established in each Junior high school, with each counselor linked to one of the five

counselors at Putnam. As part of their comprehensive career awareness program, the junior high counselors inform students of the skills training programs available at Putnam and their relation to careers. The counselors conduct visits of junior high students, in small groups, to Putnam. Translators accompany the groups whenever limited-English proficient students are included in the groups.

Because the junior high counselors have close relations with a counselor at Putnam, they are able to advise students about the specific details of the individual programs at Putnam. Each of them has received special training emphasizing "active efforts" to recruit minority and non-traditional students. Originally these counselors were funded through P.L. 94-482, but the school system has since assumed financial responsibility for them.

There is an annual special recruiting program, which has been coordinated by the Occupational Education Director since 1981 when the Admissions Plan clarified and prescribed the roles of various Springfield officials in recruiting.

The recruiters used a film strip developed by the system and a slide tape developed in conjunction with the Springfield Chamber of Commerce (using federal matching funds). The slide tape highlights the five major areas of employment opportunity in Springfield, and links each to the vocational education program(s) in the system where the relevant skills can be obtained. Slides can be changed easily to reflect changes in local employment patterns.

The principal of Putnam leads the recruiting delegation to each school, where he speaks with interested students after the presentation is completed. Because guidance counselors have been active throughout the year, the number of interested students is usually high.

Program/Curriculum Improvement at Putnam

Springfield, in cooperation with regional office staff, has also initiated a comprehensive curriculum revision program that will have important implications for equity. Each of the individual programs at Putnam is being rearranged in clusters of related programs. Each cluster will be taught on an individualized basis using core competencies, and will include programs that have traditionally appealed to one sex only along with programs that attract both sexes. The mere improvement of program quality will serve all Springfield students well, and will in itself constitute a recruiting attraction.

The New High School

The technical component of the new high school will replace, and improve significantly on, the programs currently offered at Technical High School, where most minority students have been concentrated in the outdated and ineffective programs of the school. The new school's technical offerings will be housed in a special career development wing, will reflect current employment opportunities in technical fields and use new curricula. In addition, the wing will include industrial arts programs, updated and using the new curricula from Putnam.

There are several innovative features important for equity. Ninth grade industrial arts students who apply to and are accepted by Putnam for tenth grade matriculation will lose no time, since the curricula at the two schools will be the same. Because the vocational education curricula will be the same there will be, in effect, an open campus in which students will be able to take classes at both Putnam and the new school--so that vocational students can develop academic skills and academic students can acquire more intensive skills training. This feature should be of particular importance for those (many) students who had not chosen vocational education by the 9th grade (and are now, as in most school systems) unable to pursue vocational training until after leaving their high schools.

Comments

The regional staff of the Department of Education who have worked with Springfield over the past years are pleased with the progress that has been made. They attribute it to several factors. First is the mutually cooperative working atmosphere that has been created between the Department and the school system. Second is the establishment of comprehensive plans (cooperatively developed) for the improvement of minority access to vocational education. Third is the superintendent's clear and continuing commitment to the improvement of vocational education in his system, and fourth is the direct involvement of the vocational school principal in minority recruiting.

Of course, the regional staff do not believe that the task is finished. For example, the current 9th grade career exploratory at Putnam, which should be a vehicle for recruiting minority and non-traditional students to new fields, is largely ineffective and needs to be entirely revamped. Finally, it should be pointed out that Putnam has reached the stage where minority recruiting in itself is insufficient. As pointed out earlier, there are numerous minority applicants to the school but proportion of minority students at Putnam will not increase as long as the current pattern of minority/majority admissions prevails.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN BOSTON

The access of minorities to vocational education in Boston has improved immeasurably since it was desegregated in the mid-seventies with the implementation of the Unified Plan for Vocational Education. Prior to that time, there was a two track system in which the good training programs were reserved for white students and minority students were segregated in the remaining ones. Today minority students have full access to the programs at the multi-million dollar Humphrey Occupational Resource Center, to the various magnet vocational programs of the city and to the "core" programs in the district high schools.

At issue now are questions of commitment and quality. There was only negligible monitoring of the extent of Boston's implementation of the Unified Plan before 1983, when the State Board assumed responsibility for monitoring Boston's compliance with outstanding desegregation orders at the direction of the U.S. District Court. The first monitoring report documented extensive non-compliance with significant portions of the Unified Plan. Since that time the compliance situation with regard to vocational education has improved. However, no clear declaration of commitment to excellent vocational education has been forthcoming from Boston Public Schools' leadership, and relations between the Department of Education and the School Department have been insufficiently cooperative. Although the Court did not direct the Department to evaluate the quality of vocational education in Boston, there indirect measures are available which suggest that Boston students, both white and minority, do not perceive that valuable opportunities await them in vocational education.

Boston and the State have agreed that the Court-ordered plan is outdated and an insufficient blueprint to guide the development of vocational education in Boston. Recent news in this respect is encouraging. Serious negotiation over modification of the Unified Plan has begun between Boston and the Department of Education. In addition, Boston has proposed changing the Humphrey Center from a half-day skills center to a more traditional vocational school (whose students will be full time, attending Madison Park for the non-vocational part of their education), which should make vocational education more attractive, at least to younger, in-school students.

The Humphrey Occupational Resource Center

Enrollment Patterns

The Unified Plan requires that each of the 35 programs at the Humphrey Resource Center "reflect the racial ratios established by the Court for the citywide schools."

Ideally, there would be a sufficient number of applications to each program to permit assignment of students from each racial/ethnic group in numbers that filled the program to capacity and reflected citywide ratios. In many cases, however, insufficient numbers of students from one or more racial group have applied, so the pattern of applications does not reflect citywide ratios. In such cases, the Department of Implementation has only two choices: either underenroll the programs in question (resulting in underutilized capacity) or overenroll students from the racial groups with disproportionately high numbers of applications (resulting in non-compliance).

Enrollment data from 1983 and 1984 showed a significant number of deviations from the ideal pattern of compliance. In the fall of 1984 only two programs complied with the Unified Plan requirement in all three racial categories. However, when a more generous standard was applied (deviation of 10 percentage points, compared with five points in the Unified Plan) there is evidence of progress from 1983 to 1984. The number of programs falling within the 10 point standard has increased for each of the three racial groups. Even with this generous standard, one-quarter to one-third of the programs are (depending on the racial group) out of compliance.

Application/Acceptance Patterns

In past years, Boston was in the anomalous position of having to deny acceptance to a number of Humphrey Center applicants while at the same time maintaining unfilled slots in the Center's programs--many of which had non-complying enrollment patterns. That was because Boston received applications from more students than could be accommodated in certain programs, but in disproportionate patterns from the various racial/ethnic groups. Boston attempted to balance the need to comply with Court orders with the desire to satisfy the choices of Boston students and fell short on both accounts.

Last year, part of the problem disappeared. So few students applied to the Humphrey Center--applications to the Center had been declining for several years--that Boston could accept all of them. No student was denied admission on account of the Court-ordered admission standards.

Furthermore, there was serious attrition between assignments and enrollments. Eighteen programs failed to enroll at least 80% of the White students assigned, and nineteen programs failed to enroll at least 80% of the other minority students assigned.

Consequently, the number of students enrolled in skills training programs in the fall of 1984 was far below

capacity. Enrollments dropped from 2,301 in 1983 to 1,830 in 1984--a decrease of approximately 20%. The number of enrollees from each racial group decreased in approximately the same proportions. This represented only 69% of the estimated capacity of the Humphrey Center. It is likely that the underutilization of the Center was even higher. A number of sources, both within and without the Center reported that the number of students actually attending skills-training programs was well below reported enrollments.

Significantly, the number of students in the freshman exploratory program declined even more sharply (45%), from 661 to 362. Since the exploratory program serves as a recruiting base from the Center's programs, it seems likely that next year's skills training enrollment will be even lower.

Recruitment

Recruitment is critical, both to promote compliance with the standards of the Unified Plan and to ensure that vocational education facilities are fully utilized. The enrollment data supplied by Boston show, however, that recruitment efforts are insufficient and increasingly ineffective.

The Unified Plan, recognizing that effective recruitment would be vital to the success of desegregating Boston's vocational education system, mandated a comprehensive "public information campaign" based on marketing and recruiting strategies in use around the nation. Little of this recruiting program seems ever to have been implemented. The first monitoring report of the Division of Occupational Education regional staff documented extensive non-compliance.

The Department of Education, as a result of this non-compliance finding in conjunction with patterns of underenrollment and disproportionate enrollment by race, requested from Boston a comprehensive recruiting plan. It specified that this plan should identify a full-time director of recruiting, the recruiting activities that would be undertaken and the staff and resources that would be used to implement the plan. To this date, no such plan has been provided, and Boston continues to insist that its current arrangements are adequate and effective.

Comments

Boston students, on account of the voluntary assignment policy that obtains in vocational education, have the opportunity to "vote with their feet." It seems clear that they have not elected to support the current vocational education system in Boston, but their reasons for their

decision are not as obvious. Boston has submitted a long list of reasons why its students reject vocational education, some of which have some validity (e.g., the undesirable location of the Humphrey Center) and others of which have none. For example, Boston contended that this situation merely reflects broader patterns of choice among students when--to the contrary--applications to other vocational schools in the Commonwealth have continued to rise even as the number of high school students has declined.

None of the reasons cited by Boston addressed questions of the quality and content of the education offered at the Humphrey Center.

There is some evidence that the pattern of negative attitudes and poor classroom management practices among some teachers discovered at the examination schools also exists at the Humphrey Center. Boston has been disinclined to take notice even when, as recently, the Department invited it to apply Chapter 636 funds to inservice training for Humphrey Center teachers on effective teaching practices for minority and limited-English proficient students.

It is to be hoped that Boston's extensive and sophisticated vocational facilities, which have the potential for preparing large numbers of students for effective participation in the job market, will realize this potential as a result of the planning now underway. A clear commitment from Boston to an excellent vocational education system is the first, but critical, step toward fulfilling the promise of desegregation initiated by the Unified Plan in 1975.

Effective Desegregated Schools

by Michael J. Alves and Paula T. Willis

This part of our report provides working descriptions of certain urban elementary, middle and senior high schools in Massachusetts that are clearly striving to become educational effective desegregating schools.

These particular schools represent a cross-section of more than 250 desegregating schools throughout the Commonwealth, and are being profiled for the Board for several reasons.

1. These are schools whose desegregation-related accomplishments have generally gone unrecognized outside of their local communities. Unlike the Trotter School in Boston, the New North School in Springfield and many other successful desegregating schools, the schools in this report have received little external acclaim and affirmation.

2. Each of these schools operates under explicit desegregation constraints that vary from system to system. Therefore, these are urban schools that serve a racially and culturally diverse student population of which a significant number are from low income families. More precisely, these are the kind of schools that educate children who are most "at risk" of being underserved in the educational marketplace.

3. These are also schools in which the academic performance of all students, and particularly minority and low income students, has demonstrably improved during the course of desegregation. A common theme echoed throughout these narratives is that these are schools in which leadership is grounded in the belief that "all children can and must learn."

4. Despite variations in size, community, grade-structure, instructional strategies, student assignment policies, and teaching and learning styles, these are schools which have developed a distinctive relationship with parents. That is, the principals and teachers of these effective urban schools see parents as a vital and essential educational resource and that active efforts are made to treat parents as true "partners" in educational mission of the school.

Lastly, in reading these profiles the Board should note that these are not the only effective desegregating schools in the state. In fact, this report provides merely a sample of the exemplary urban schools in such communities as Boston, Cambridge, Holyoke, Lowell, Medford, Springfield, Worcester, and elsewhere. In developing the report our aim was to have local educators focus on those schools which are not well known and in which "ordinary" people--students, parents, teachers and administrators--were performing extraordinary deeds on a daily basis. Key questions posed to the schools included:

1. Why should parents enroll their children in this school - What makes this school effective? For example:

   Teaching and Learning Style
   Special Programs
   School Climate or Atmosphere
   External Resources
   Academic Reputation/Quality of Instruction
   Leadership Style
   Philosophy of Education
   Teacher/Parent Expectations
   Internal Evaluation and Assessment of Academic Achievement

2. How do parents interact with this school - formal and informal means of participation? For example:

   Parent Councils/PTA
   School Visitations (parent and school initiated)
   School Volunteers
   Instructional Support

3. Do you encourage active parent participation in this school and do you feel that this involvement makes a difference in explaining the effectiveness of the school?

4. Has the quality of education improved for minority and low income students in this school, and how do you account for this success?

5. If another school had a similar student/parent population, what concrete advice would you give them in making that school an effective desegregated school?

We think the major point to be made by these first-hand accounts is, if quality integrated education can flourish in these particular schools, then why not in every school?

PROFILED SCHOOLS

LEA	SCHOOL	GRADE-LEVEL	MAGNET (M) NON-MAGNET (NM)	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	MINORITY %	LOW-INCOME %
BOSTON	CHITTICK	K-5	NM	397	88%	53%
	HALEY	K-5	M	312	72%	73%
	HARVARD/KENT	K-5	NM	451	75%	86%
	GREW	K-5	NM	221	53%	70%
	PARKMAN	K-5	NM	199	79%	90%
	IRVING	6-8	NM	633	70%	67%
	McCORMACK	6-8	NM	565	60%	73%
	BOSTON HIGH	9-12	M	821	79%	NA
	DORCHESTER	9-12	NM	996	84%	NA
	JAMAICA PLAIN	9-12	NM	853	80%	NA
CAMBRIDGE	FLETCHER	K-8	M	383	45%	61%
	MORSE	K-8	M	342	47%	56%
	PEABODY	K-8	M	419	48%	31%
HOLYOKE	DONAHUE	4-6	NM	188	48%	80%
	KIRTLAND	K-3	NM	273	45%	53%
	LAWRENCE	4-6	M	527	60%	74%
LOWELL	CITY SCHOOL	K-8	M	200	39%	73%
	ROGERS	K-8	M	589	29%	84%
MEDFORD	BROOKS/HOBBS	K-8	M	543	24%	13%
SPRINGFIELD	BOWLES	K-4	NM	385	56%	66%
	HOMER	K-4	NM	363	72%	77%
	WARNER	5-6	M	372	49%	55%
WORCESTER	CANTERBURY	K-6	M	372	24%	77%
	CLARK STREET	K-8	M	356	30%	48%
	BURNCOAT	K-6	M	304	37%	50%

BEST COPY

Boston

School: JAMES J. CHITTICK (K-5) (Mattapan)

The Chittick School is a K-5 school in an area of the city that has an 80% minority, 20% white population. It is a neighbrorhood school where 95% of the children can walk.

The philosophy of this school is "All Children Can Learn." It is basically a traditional program that stresses academic achievement with a heavy emphasis on basic skills. Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics achievement are the paramount goals. This is based on the new Curriculum Guides in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics that were introduced a year ago.

In order to keep children at or above their potential learning level, there are programs to both assist children with learning problems and advance children who are gifted. Testing is done twice a year to aid teachers in planning instructional strategies.

Reading is taught by the grade teacher. There is a remedial Reading teacher to give support to children who need help. At all times, we strive to keep children at or above grade level. A Library reading program fosters out of school reading and participation in various Reading programs enable each child to increase his/her reading ability and knowledge of the world about him.

A Chapter 636 State-funded reading and math program also works with children whose teachers recommend for individual one to one teaching. This is done for specific curriculum goals and children move in and out of the program as their specific deficits are met. We have two resource room teachers who remediate children with learning problems who come under Chapter 766, a Special Education program.

Some of the special programs offered in addition to the above are:

Talented and Gifted
This program gives supplementary lessons in various subjects to children who are above average academically. This is determined by test scores. Subjects included in the program are science, literature, creative writing, advanced math, French and multi-cultural activities. Children in Grades 1-5 participate in the program.

Computer Education
All children Kindergarten through grade 5 are given computer training. Most software combine supplementary lessons in math, reading, writing, science and social studies.

Science
There is a hands-on science program in its first year of development. The science support teacher organized materials and curriculum goals for each grade and confers with teachers to assist them in planning and implementing science lessons. New and up to date science books have been obtained in each grade and these books are closely correlated with the new Science Curriculum in Boston.

Music
The Community Music Center in Boston helped implement the Music Program which includes--Music theory and singing in grades 1-5. A 40-member chorus has performed in many parts of the city and for parents. The New England Conservatory gives grades 4 and 5 children group lessons on the trumpet or trombone to those requesting it.

Drama
Children in grades 4 and 5 have the experience of performing in plays which the school as a whole attends. Some of the recent performances have been "Santa Goes Mod," "The Magic Pan" and the "Musicians of Bremen."

The school has a good sized library and a librarian. All children visit the library each week. Story time for kindergarten and Grade 1 children is a part of the program. We have an audio visual program plus cablevision capacity.

We have an early childhood program for four-year old children half a day, and an extended day kindergarten

II program for five-year olds. These children attend school all day and readiness for grade 1 is an integral part of the curriculum.

Parents are very involved with the school and its operation. Many parents work in the library, do tutoring, and assist teachers with materials. We have an active parent council who provide many kinds of help to improve and/or assist the school's operation.

Recently they provided $2,000 for computer software and planned activities in which parents and children participate. Last June a trip to an island in Boston Harbor, Thompson's Island, was the site of an all day outing. Parents are welcome in the school at any time.

The school staff is of a very high caliber and the school climate is excellent. Our academic reputation is high and we strive to stay on top. Our average attendance rate is about 94.5% each day with a student body of 400 children. Certificates of Perfect Attendance are given out each month to children who have had no absences. One of our students has been a citywide grade level spelling winner for the past two years and many of our children are invited to attend academically talented classes in grades four and six.

Many trips to local cultural institutions are planned each year including the Museum of Science, Fine Arts Museum, Children's Museum, Public Libraries, N.E. Aquarium, visits to the Top of the Hub and the Strand Theatre. Other cultural programs are brought into the school including Young Audiences, Cranberry Puppet Players and School Volunteers for Boston.

School: HENRY GREW SCHOOL (K-5) (Hyde Park)

The Henry Grew School, a Boston Public School, is an excellent example of an educationally effective desegregated elementary school. The school contains grades K-5, including a half-day kindergarten I program for four year old children, and a half-day and extended day Kindergarten II program for five year old children. While stressing basic skills, the Henry Grew School offers to its pupils a comprehensive elementary education centered around a school-based, cross-graded, homogeneous program in reading. This program provides for individual student educational growth as well as socio-emotional adjustment. Pairing

support is received from the Mattapan Health Unit and the Human Services Collaborative. The Grew School also participates in the Boston School Improvement Program.

Among the special programs that the Grew offers to its students is an enrichment program for its talented and gifted students. Other special programs include a Community Music Program, which encompasses all grades, but provides all Grades 3-5 students with the opportunity to play a musical instrument and a Computer Education program in which there is a student/computer ratio of approximately 25:1.

The Grew School also participates in and benefits from the Foster Grandparent Program and the School Volunteers for Boston. The school receives state funding under Chapter 636 for these programs, as well as other state and private funding.

Because of its relatively small size and the dedication of its staff, the Grew School has been able to foster a school climate in which children have been able to feel safe and happy while making progress in their education. Although students are assigned to specific homerooms, all staff members are both directly and indirectly involved in the social and academic growth of each student. The children sense and respond to the genuine warmth and caring which the staff feels toward them, as well as toward each other. This sense of security provides a school climate which supports concentration and learning.

The Grew School's philosophy toward discipline helps to establish the school's positive climate. Its orientation is a traditional one in the sense that children are provided with basic sets of rules to provide for the safety, well-being, happiness and education of all students. All teachers adhere to this philosophy, thus providing a school-wide attitude that the Henry Grew School is a safe and orderly institution which supports a sense of security and fosters an atmosphere of serious work.

Briefly the Grew School philosophy subscribes to the characteristics for effective schools described in the various students of Ronald Edmonds. These characteristics are:

1. Strong administrative leadership
2. Emphasis on a safe, orderly school environment

3. High expectations for all students by all teachers

4. Emphasis on academic achievement through emphasis on basic skills

5. Close monitoring of student progress, with follow-up by staff and parents.

Internal evaluation and re-evaluation, teacher assessment and the results from citywide testing programs such as the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, the Curriculum Criterion Referenced Tests, the Degrees of Reading Power tests, and the Botel tests as well as an extremely positive commentary by the Chapter 766 CHIPIR auditing team indicate that, to a great degree, the Grew School has successfully met its objectives.

Parents are actively involved and strongly encouraged to participate in the two parent organizations of the school, the School Parent Council and the Home and School Association. Members of both associations visit the school daily and enhance the school programs through financial and volunteer support to our students. Through the integration of our parent groups, needs have been addressed to improve the quality of race relations in our school community.

The quality of education has improved for all students (and particularly for minority students) as evidenced by the 1984 Metropolitan Reading/Math Achievement scores in addition to growth as reported by the citywide Curriculum Criterion Referenced Testing.

We at the Henry Grew School attribute our social and academic success to strict adherence to our philosophy and its actual application on a day-to-day basis.

If another school had a similar student/parent population, we would offer them the following advice in order to make that school an effective desegregated school.

1. Make the effectiveness of your school a team effort. Supportiveness and sharing of faculty members adds so much to a positive working atmosphere which spills over into making the learning atmosphere a positive one as well.

2. Commit yourself to emphasizing Basic Skills instruction. A strict adherence to time-on-task in Reading and Math along with a strict adherence to curriculum results in academic improvement in the elementary school.

3. The principal must provide leadership in all areas. He/she must be involved in curriculum development and instruction as well as being a good manager.

4. Provide a strong, positive school climate and environment. Let each child know that all staff is interested in his/her physical safety and academic progress. Provide formulated sets of rules which will establish and maintain this climate. This climate supports concentration and learning.

5. Provide high expectations for all students. All students should be expected to make a year's progress in a year's time.

6. Emphasize the basic skills of Reading, Math, and Language Arts. Establish specific time periods for these skills every day. Insist on adherence to the time schedule by the teachers and insist on time-on-task from all students.

7. Monitor student's progress continuously and provide frequent feedback to students and their parents. Establish teacher/parent contact early in the school year and maintain it throughout the year.

In conclusion, no one at the Henry Grew School would feel that this commitment to excellence has been an easy task, but it has been extremely rewarding to both teachers and students. All experience the feeling of success and accomplishment that is necessary for the fulfillment of personal goals.

School: DENNIS C. HALEY (K-5) (Roslindale)

There are several reasons why parents feel that the Dennis C. Haley School is the school that they would like to enroll their children at. During the months of March and April we generally have between 50-85 parents visiting the school prior to Spring enrollment. The vast majority of these parents are

interested in Kindergarten and first grade openings. I make it a point to personally show them the school, describe its programs and discuss any concerns or questions they have. During the course of these discussions I always ask them what it was that attracted them to our particular school. It would appear that the main attraction is our exceptionally high academic achievement in grades 1-3 program, called G.A.P. Another attraction that was constantly mentioned was the high degree of involvement by parents in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of school programs and activities. These will be mentioned in more detail further on in this report. Other attractions mentioned to a lesser degree were the emphasis on science, our magnet school theme, the general school climate and atmosphere, and recommendations by parents of students already enrolled.

Parent participation at various levels usually occurs in one of three different ways. We have a School Parent Council group that is tied in with a citywide parent group. These parents are organized under the court mandated parent involvement program. They represent several different racial groups including black, white, Asian, and Hispanic parents. Their responsibility is to monitor programs, activities and any other school related happenings to insure that the citywide desegregation policies are being followed. These particular concerns have lessened to an almost insignificant degree over the years since the desegregation programs were first instituted. Racial harmony among students, parents and staff is almost taken for granted in school activities since any race related incidents are so rare. The School Parent Council also works in close cooperation with another parent/staff group called the School Site Council. This group is the planning group made up of parents, teachers and administration whose primary objectives are to develop, revise, or expand on educational programs. These groups are also the coordinators of several school functions promoting closer relationships and interest throughout our parent population. These functions include a holiday bazaar, two book sales, an international dinner and a Spring fair. The parents with staff assistance publish a monthly newsletter and also organize a fall orientation night for parents. Another avenue for parent involvement is the parent volunteer program. We have a cadre of talented parents who volunteer time and effort in several areas including computer classes, library, art, science, multi-cultural units, and reading.

These are parents whose expertise not only offers a unique approach to subject areas but also allows for more small group instruction and use of individualized help.

From previous statements it is quite obvious that parent participation is one of the cornerstones of the successful school program being implemented at the Haley School. Besides the direct benefit of [illegible]hing our Academic programs it also gives the [illegible]ildren and parents a more personal feeling about the whole open door philosophy of our school. They do not feel that wall that is sometimes created in schools to separate the home from the school. There are very strong feelings of pride, enthusiasm and belonging that encompass the entire school community as one group striving towards a common goal. The interaction among parents and teachers has also reduced the tension that many times arises in schools when parents feel that the school staff is intimidating or when teachers feel parents are critics of their quality of teaching. There is a great deal of communication both formally and informally between teachers and parents.

We have found that in the past few years the quality of education for minority and low income students has improved significantly. A graphic example of this is the acceptance of twelve students from the third grade, over 20%, into the advanced work program being implemented citywide. This group included six black, three Hispanic and three white students. This is almost exactly the racial breakdown of our enrollment. Also, the Metropolitan Reading and Mathematics Achievement Tests seem to indicate that minority students at the Haley School score dramatically higher than the citywide averages. This occurs particularly in grades one to three. I believe that the creative grouping programs offering small group instruction and the active parent participation in all aspects of school operation account for much of this success. Add to this a dedicated able staff who are extremely proud of the school's accomplishments and you have the ingredients for a successful school. I might also add that from 1982-1984 the first three grades at the Haley School have never scored lower than first or second in the magnet school district (Metropolitan Reading Achievement) which includes ten elementary schools. If these scores were averaged for the three years in those grades we would be among the top three schools citywide each year.

I believe that any other school with a comparable student/parent population could become an effective desegregated school if several basic tenants were adopted.

1. New concepts, ideas and techniques should be investigated.
2. Educational programs should be constantly revised, expanded and closely inspected to maximize benefits to students.
3. Administration and staff must be sensitive to students' and parents' needs and concerns of both on an individual and group level.
4. Parents can be an invaluable source of assistance at almost every level of school operation.
5. It is extremely important to develop a sense of pride and belonging among students, parents, and school personnel.
6. Finally, as a summary: when the entire school community plan, implement, and evaluate programs with the common objective of student improvement, academically, emotionally, and socially, success should be imminent.

School: HARVARD-KENT (K-5) (Charlestown)

The philosophy of the school is to provide a format and educational setting where children are free to learn at their own pace. The teacher serves as a facilitator of learning, providing an arranged environment, materials, audio-visual experiences, motivation, guidance and assistance.

The educational objectives are to help each child gain at least minimal competency in the basics, but to motivate them to go beyond these minimal goals in order to prepare them to take their place in a multi-ethnic society in which they will live and function harmoniously.

The school's reading plan developed by the Administration and the entire staff was designed to enable each child to meet the requirements of minimal competence, master all the curriculum objectives, and encourage the student to learn to his highest capability.

To assist each child in attaining this goal, school-wide focus was placed on Reading--Phonics and Subskills, Comprehension and Oral Reading.

The computer program which Chapter I initiated was continued with ten new Commodore 64 computers.

Many children in Regular Education were introduced to and are working with the fifteen new IBM PCjr computers on a weekly basis.

There is a large Chinese Bilingual Program at this school. We have seven Bilingual classes and an ESL class. We will have a variety of Special Education programs--L/AB Cluster, Resource Room and LD class.

Our breakfast and lunch program, with most of the children receiving free or reduced priced meals, was operated successfully and efficiently.

The atmosphere of the school remains one of quiet, peaceful learning situation in which students generally feel safe and comfortable. There were no major incidents or disruptions. Suspensions were kept to a minimum.

In an overall view, I believe that the children of the Harvard-Kent School receive an excellent, substantial and integrated education. I also believe that through the efforts of an excellent staff, the children develop a sense of both personal and school pride.

Parents were very helpful to us during the school year. Many members of parent groups volunteered to serve on committees and the Home and School Association provided the students with field trips for every class, graduation awards and prizes for academic and attendance excellence.

We have two Open House meetings during the school year, one in November and the other in May. There is always a large turnout of parents for these occasions. The School Parent Council has five to ten meetings a year and they discuss their ideas and concerns with the Administration.

We have several school volunteers who come on a regular basis (some daily) to offer their services in remedial or supplemental instruction.

There is a great deal of testing of students in this school. We have the Metropolitan Reading and Math tests in the Fall and again in the Spring. The third grade has a Listening Test in January. In May the children will be tested in the Curriculum Objectives. Grades 1-3 will have the Botal Reading Test and Grades 4 and 5 the Degrees of Reading Power Test at the end of May.

The children of the Harvard-Kent School showed an overall growth in both their reading and math ability during the last school year.

Considering the fact that a disproportionate number of the children tested are in Bilingual and Special Education programs, test results are proof that education and learning are taking place in this school.

We will utilize the test information to focus on improving the results in next year's tests although our main goal will be the actual improvement in student individual reading skills and ability.

The school median in the Metropolitan Achievement Test increased from 50 to 64 in Reading and from 62 to 70 in Math for the years 1983, 1984.

To have an effective desegregated school I think that if the systemwide priorities of the Boston Public Schools are followed, you can attain this goal. These priorities are Quality Education which would include curriculum and competency.

Equal Access which allows all students regardless of race, color, economic status or physical handicap to be assured of an appropriate education.

Accountability, not only of the school to the parent, but conversely the parent to the school. Parents must be involved in a constructive way in decisions that affect the educational experiences of their child.

School: FRANCIS PARKMAN (K-5) (Jamaica Plain)

The Francis Parkman School is located at 25 Walk Hill Street, Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts. We serve the communities of Roxbury, Roslindale, and Jamaica Plain. We offer a structured educational plan with emphasis placed on teaching the basic academic subjects: reading, writing, language arts and mathematics. The Parkman School is a charter member of the Boston School Improvement Project (BSIP) which promotes administrative leadership, high teacher expectation, and student achievement. The program at the Parkman School is based on the philosophy, "All children can learn." The reading plan requires that all teachers set aside each day an uninterrupted period for reading.

The primary grades receive intensive training in phonics, word attack skills, word recognition, silent and oral reading. The elementary classes continue the language arts training in spelling, writing, reading comprehension, and vocabulary development. Teacher and student efforts are rewarded with pupil mastery and higher scores on achievement tests.

The Francis Parkman has an active School Parent Council and also parent members of the Home and School Association. The School maintains an open-door policy and we have had the opportunity to use the services of School Volunteers and found it a valuable addition to our school program.

The Parkman School has the following programs designed to meet the needs of individual students:

The Resource Room for pupils with moderate special need.
Language classes (3)
Learning Adaptive Behavior class
A Speech therapist, services of the school doctor and nurse and a pupil Evaluator.
Extended Day Kindergarten, Grades 1-5 regular education, 636 remedial reading, 636 Science, physical education, art and music, and computer science.

The Francis Parkman School is fortunate in that we are approaching the ideal racial and ethnic balance for desegregation. The school population includes 113 Black children, 40 White children, 13 Oriental pupils, 37 Hispanic and 1 Native American. The classrooms reflect a multi-ethnic grouping and the school is rewarded with an appreciation of a multicultural awareness of this diverse population. The Francis Parkman staff also reflects a similar popultion diversity. Everyone benefits from the educationally effective desegregated Parkman School. We learn to live, learn, work, and grow in an environment of harmony.

The quality of education has improved in the school during the past four years. The morale is good among the staff. The parents have confidence in the school program. They are welcome here. There is a desire among the neighborhood parents to send their youngsters to the Parkman Extended Day Kindergarten. We believe that the Parkman pupils are ready for grade one when they complete kindergarten. They have had a structured academic program.

The Parkman School Education plan has as its priority mastery of the basic skills at all grade levels from Extended Day Kindergarten to grade five. To achieve this goal we plan parental conferences, peer tutoring, use of outside agency to provide help, assignment to Chapter I program. Use of 636 funds for remediation in reading and language arts. The principal is an integral part of the Parkman Plan and provides leadership for reaching the goal.

Test scores on file for the past four years record the steady progress made by the pupils of the Francis Parkman School. We will continue our effort for skill mastery because we believe that is our purpose as educators.

School: JOHN WINTHROP ELEMENTARY (K-5) (Roxbury)

The John Winthrop Elementary School (K-5) emphasizes the basic skills, recognizing that these are essential in today's complex world. Reading is given priority based on a solid background of phonics and utilizing a variety of approaches. Fundamental computational skills are also stressed. These skills are taught in an atmosphere which supports and encourages the cultural plurality of the student population. The school is paired with the University of Massachusetts-Boston, Institute for Learning and Teaching. To support the regular education teachers, there is a basic skills coordinator as well as a Chapter I Reading teacher. For children with special needs, programs include one supportive academic remediation class (SAR), three SAR Classes with a language component, and a Resource Room. Our eight station computer lab will be expanded to fifteen in 1985-86.

As to what makes the Winthrop effective, I would cite an experienced, stable, competent, caring staff whose basic philosopohy is that every child can learn. It is the responsibility of the school administration to create an atmosphere in which this learning can take place. Parents must be assured that their children are in a safe secure environment. They must be encouraged to take an active part in their children's education. Communication, then, is essential. A Parent Newsletter goes home every month. Parents are encouraged to visit the school at any time, not only when there is a problem. If necessary, telephone conferences are held, often after school hours. Since this has been done since the first days of Desegregation, the parents have become our best publicists. We have used them time and again to reach out to the community.

PERFORMANCE DATA
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS (MAT)

Median
Percentile

	Reading			Math	
	1984	1983		1984	1983
Gr. 5	66	60	Gr.5	68	60
4	50	44	4	66	40
3	52	42	3	62	26
2	96	46	2	98	72
1	84	72	1	86	80
School Median	68	52	**School Median**	76	62

School: WASNINGTON IRVING MIDDLE (6-8) (Roslindale)

The Washington Irving Middle School has a traditional education program with strong emphasis on the development of basic skills and their application to other areas of study. Incorporated into the program is instruction in Foreign Languages, Fine Arts, Manual Arts, Career Education, Physical Education and Health Skills. Any student reading below grade level is serviced through a targeted Reading Program for Grades 6 and 7, a Chapter I Reading Program or a long-established Chapter 636 Remedial Reading Program. This school also offers a Chapter I Math Program. The school is the location of the Southeast Asian and Greek Transitional Bilingual Education Program. Program support is provided by Boston College. Advanced Work Classes are housed in the Irving and continued as part of the program for the Achievement of Individual Potential for sixth, seventh and eighth grade students.

The school is proud of its improved academic performance evidenced by an increased in the school's median percentile in the Metropolitan Test. Reading scores rose from 44 in 1983 to 54 in 1984 and math scores in the same period went from 44 to 52. Effectiveness in this regard is due partially to an experienced stable faculty, most of whom have an excess of 10 years of service at this school. This allows for formulating and meeting long-term objectives, and a continuity of instruction. Systems

of Guidance, peer pairing for new teachers helps them to become quickly integrated into the academic structure thereby giving newcomers a vital sense of support and a feeling of belonging.

Additionally, there are a number of diverse programs that are designed to meet not only the academic needs of all students, but also the social, cultural, emotional, psychological and physical needs of most students.

A Chapter 636 grant designed to draw on the ethnic diversity of our student body has been in place at the school since the beginning of the academic year. The Performing Arts Workshop enables all students to find cultural expression through both the performing and visual arts.

The Boston Student Human Service Collaborative acts as the vehicle for outside agencies and medical groups to provide services to students. Some of the agencies involved in the effort are: Boston City Hospital; Boston Youth Program; Harvard Street Neighborhood Center; West-Ros-Park Mental Health Center; South Cove Community Health Center; Indo-Chinese Children and Adolescent Services; Black Achievers Program (YMCA); Freedom from Chemical Dependency Program; Planned Parenthood; and Boston Area Health Education Center.

Another facet of the Student Human Services Collaborative is the Re-CAP Program. This program enables students who have fallen behind their grade level peers to fulfill a contract which commits them to maintaining passing grades in all subjects, better than average conduct marks and near perfect attendance. This enables them to earn advancement to a higher grade midway through an academic year.

The most significant feature and the greatest asset in the area of staff development, which is a vital aspect of the school's successful program, is the creation and staffing of the Director of Instruction and Instructional Support Teacher positions. These two positions, have the most profound impact on every aspect of the total academic program. (Editorial note: According to the March 27 Boston Globe, the "instructional support" positions are being eliminated for budgetary reasons.)

The school is on a cluster system. This allows for approximately 130 students to take all academic classes with four or five teachers exclusively. Throughout the year, these teachers meet on a weekly

or twice weekly basis to review student academic performance and to identify those students who are in particular need, e.g., in danger of academic failure and work to fashion a program for them which might include remediation, a referral to some other school department or some outside agency, or to formulate some other plan.

Over the years, the administration and faculty of the school has courted and encouraged active parental involvement in all school activities. The Washington Irving Home and School Association has, in the past, contributed thousands of dollars in educational and instructional supplies, equipment and materials. The Association has donated books, equipment, carpeting and furniture to the school library. It has also donated tape recorders, televisions, projectors and duplicating machines to the school. It hosts and funds the annual awards night which attracts over 600 parents.

The School Parent Council is also actively involved in school operation, such as curriculum, bus services, school maintenance and repairs, the generation of the school-based budget and formulation of school-based rules. The Parent Council in the past year has hosted an International Night and also a Faculty Appreciation Dinner.

The Washington Irving School boasts an in-school lending library, with a huge selection of books, periodicals and other resource materials. Two computer laboratories are furnished with 27 computers and four printers to which every student in the school has access. It also has a prestigious and long standing chapter of the National Honor Society. The school sponsors an extensive and wide ranging field trip program. An active student council meets on a regular basis to plan and carry out activities, to discuss school problems and to pass on their recommendations to the principal.

The attendance rate has, in the past two years, risen significantly from 81.7% to 87.4%. The rate of tardiness has dropped dramatically. Both of these results have been achieved by the use of a clerical person who maintains close contact with the home of those students who would normally be either truant or tardy.

School: JOHN W. MCCORMACK MIDDLE SCHOOL (6-8) (Dorchester)

The John W. McCormack Middle School was designed and built as a middle school in 1967. The school is organized by clusters which include advanced work class students and transitional bilingual students.

The student population is 26% Black, 45% White, 26 Hispanic, 1% Oriental and 2% American Indian. The academic program emphasizing skills and knowledge includes reading five times per week, fine arts, computer education, and unified arts. To meet early adolescent needs, Re-CAP (a contractual student advancement program to impact students who are over age for their grades because they have been retained), tutoring, SSAT preparation, adolescent counseling, and student leadership training are provided.

Several special features make the McCormack Middle School successful:

1. All activities and programs are organized and documented in a memo of agreement during the fall.
2. There is an activities (Monday, a.m.) and art program which involves teacher and cultural institutions such as MJT Dance and Children's Museum.
3. In addition to the student leadership program there is a student service organization called the COBRAS. Members do good will deeds. This notion of service has been augmented recently through the Kennedy Foundation Resources. The Kennedy Corps is now engaged in activities performed by students under close teacher supervision, such as computer education for senior citizens from local nursing homes and neighborhood cleanup projects.
4. Sister Clusters. These are made up of one bilingual and one monolingual class which meet two periods every day. Students are paired 50% bilingual and 50% monolingual in the same classroom for instructional purposes in grades 6 and 7 to prepare students for successful full-time academic and social integration at the next grade level.

Academic programs have been improved in the following ways:

1. Programs are organized to set schoolwide standards of excellence through weekly cluster meetings with the principal; inservice meetings; and effective use of Director of Instruction and Instructional Support Teacher.

2. Upon entering grade 6 students may be assigned to an Advanced Work Class or Regular Education Program, both of which include homogeneous math instruction and small group instruction for both reading and language arts.
3. School wide academic events such as essay contests, social studies fairs and science fairs establish more uniform standards of student performance and raise teacher and student expectations for success.
4. Staff training options are available in social studies and science from the Children's Museum, interactive strategies, and extensive computer training to fully utilize IBM P.C. Jr. labs. There are also opportunities for peer observation and videotaping.

Academic performance of students is increasing significantly. The school median on Metropolitan Achievement Tests shows a jump in math from the 42nd percentile in 1983 to the 54th percentile in 1984 and an increase in reading scores from the 40th percentile to the 46th percentile.

Some reasons for this improved achievement include:

1. Scheduling, grouping, and organization of the school reflect the educational priorities that have been set.
2. In addition to sufficient staffing which has allowed for full implementation of BPS objectives and goals, the staff is knowledgeable about the implementation of programs unique to early adolescent learning.
3. The staff has worked hard to strike a balance in emphasizing the attainment of achievement while understanding the need to motivate and develop the desire to achieve with every student. To this end, extensive award assemblies are held after each report card distribution with the most prominent trophies reserved for academic achievement.
4. Involvement of institutions. The U.Mass Tutorial Program, the Bank of Boston Computer Lab Assistance Program, the Tri-Lateral Council for Quality Education and the McCormack Summer Enrichment Program all supplement regular school programs.

Parental involvement is an important aspect of the McCormack's success.

1. A priority has been established to provide accurate and timely information to parents. This is done in several ways:

a. The McCormack Handbook provides all pertinent information to students and parents at the beginning of the school year.
b. Open House for parents is held after each report card distribution to provide a follow up on student achievement and progress.
c. School Parent Council Meetings. Monthly meetings are held in the evening so that working parents can attend easily and there is also a significant number of teacher and administrator representation.

2. To stimulate community interest in the school a Chapter 636 Outreach Program supports stipend payment to parents for participating in school and community activities. In particular two programs have brought out wide parent participation. These are the family night at Children's Museum and the Family Art Night at U. Mass.
3. A special Open House is held each spring for students in grade 5 schools who normally feed into the McCormack. The open house helps set the tone for parents and allows them to visit the school before their child attends.

School: BOSTON HIGH SCHOOL (9-12)

Boston High School is a citywide magnet school featuring a work experience program, strong preparation in basic skills, and a positive learning climate. Academic achievement for minority and low income students has shown significant improvement and student attendance has increased from 79.4 to 85.2 percent in the past year. The school population reflects the diversity of racial/ethnic groups within the Boston Public Schools. Administrators and teachers at the school have used an organized approach for raising performance levels for all students. Its chief components include an emphasis on basic skills, a systematic program to build test-taking skills, and a clear perception of the goals to be reached.

Overview

Boston High School's magnet theme, work experience, is realized through a program that places students in supervised private industry jobs for part of the school year. Students earn and pay taxes on a total of over $2,000,000 per year. The curriculum is comprehensive, offering courses in both college and business preparatory programs. Instruction is both remedial and developmental to accommodate the range of

student needs. The school has a bilingual program. Educational philosophy follows old-fashioned, time-honored principles; discipline is strict and the atmosphere is friendly but businesslike.

Curriculum and Organization

Since its inception in the mid-sixties, the school's program of studies and teaching has focused on the improvement of reading, writing, and mathematics. Two-thirds of the students at each grade level are encouraged to take electives that are related to the core basic skills curriculum. More than 66 percent of ninth graders elect Critical Reading, Literature and Composition, or Remedial Reading in adition to the required English course. Until the 1983-1984 school year, however, school endeavors to improve student achievement had not paid significant dividends in terms of higher academic achievement.

Direction

By 1983, the prodding of the Boston Compact Office and the superintendent's office moved the school's administrative team to meet and wrestle with the problem of low scores. The team concluded that gains would result when:

a) achievement was squarely confronted and made a priority issue in the school
b) all school personnel were engaged in the effort to improve performance
c) a variety of approaches to the problem were tried

In September 1983, teachers and administrators started the new school year eager to raise student achievement levels. Nine months later, students were tested.

Results indicated that significant gains had occurred. The school median on the Metropolitan Reading Test had increased by seven percentiles. On the Metropolitan Mathematics Test, the school median jumped 28 percentiles.

Activities

Boston High School's administrators and teachers believe the following list of activities is responsible for the improved achievement for minority and low income students:

1. The school's administrative team used every teacher in-service and student assembly to

motivate everyone to concentrate on boosting basic skills.

2. Teachers and administrators motivated 12th grade students by stressing the need for achieving preset performance standards in reading and mathematics. This, students were told, was necessary if students were to be considered for priority employment by the business community after graduation.

3. Homeroom teachers shared test results with students in counseling sessions and discussed the data with parents.

4. Classroom teachers in English and Mathematics set for each student a 1984 performance goal at least 20 percent higher than his/her 1983 level of achievement. Teachers constantly motivated students and reminded them of their goals.

5. One month before testing, social studies and business teachers worked with students' reading skills. Finding the main idea and identifying supporting details was a task in each reading and typing assignment.

6. Mathematics teachers used more reading/word problems in their math classes throughout the year in order to help students better understand concepts and functions required in problem solving on standardized tests.

7. The administration assigned students who failed to reach a pre-determined level of competency in Math to take additional Mathematics courses. This was done even though a student may have earned enough points to satisfy graduation requirements.

Summary

A significant increase in 1984 achievement levels for students at Boston High School was the result of a number of school activities which, for the first time, were directed specifically at improved student achievement.

School: DORCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL (9-12)

Dorchester High School, a comprehensive district school, is one of four high schools in the city that have shown steady gains in student achievement, particularly among minority and low income students as

a result the school system's desegregation efforts. Currently the school's population reflects the district's racial-ethnic diversity and the strong cultural traditions of the surrounding community. Performance in reading and math is inching upward and student attendance is also improving. Identified as an effective school by parents, teachers and central office administrators, Dorchester High School is distinctive for the effective use of wide range organizations, citywide programs, and the unversity and business pairings that came about through desegregation. Teachers and administrators have taken hold of these resources and tailored them to meet the unique pattern of student and staff needs at the school.

Overview

Dorchester High School offers courses in college and career preparation, grades 9-12. The school features two citywide magnet programs - Health Careers and Home Improvement Enterprise - designed to give students the necessary academic and practical skills for entry into the health care and home renovation fields. Computers are used in the curriculum in math and business classes to develop computer literacy and to help students meet the challenges of the changing job market of the 1980's and beyond. It has a Private Industry Council jobs coordinator and a Junior ROTC program. An affiliation with the Urban Scholars and Challenge programs of the University of Massachusetts is an added resource for Dorchester High School students. Pairing support comes from the University of Massachusetts at Boston and the New England Telephone Company as well as from 15 community social service agencies.

Curriculum and Organization

Citywide curriculum objectives in English and mathematics, introduced two years ago, provide the instructional standards for students at Dorchester High School. Ninth graders, flexibly grouped in clusters, are required to take and pass courses in reading, English, and mathematics as well as to participate in career awareness and job preparation programs. Clustering allows for more individualization of instruction, team teaching and planning, and academic and social support for new students. The belief that strong, dynamic programs are the best preventative for student dropouts is evident in the special attention given to the ninth grade curriculum.

School Plan

The school's comprehensive plan to improve the quality of education at Dorchester High School has four priorities: 1) to improve basic skills for all students; 2) to improve school attendance; 3) to provide opportunities for career exploration and job preparation; and 4) to create higher education awareness programs and opportunities.

Special Programs/Resources

In addition to the citywide magnet programs mentioned above--Health Careers and Home Improvement Enterprise--Dorchester has two unique programs to identify high-potential students and to support them in preparing for college. The Challenge Program is a special program for low income, college-bound students that brings instructors from the University of Massachusetts in Amherst to work with students. The Urban Scholars Program enrolls students in classes taught by faculty of the U/Mass, Boston. Both groups receive automatic admission to the university when they complete the programs with full financial aid.

Test awareness, a program for all students in the school, is designed to help students master test-taking strategies and to overcome problems with standardized tests that often prevent students from showing their true ability. This schoolwide effort occurs once a month and uses electronic scoring to get data on student achievement quickly and accurately.

An active student recruitment program takes place each year, consisting of a presentation to each middle school in the city, a massive mailing, publications, a monthly update, and school tours. Students who express an interest in the school are invited to attend classes for a day. The recruitment program has been well-received by middle schools and has drawn students from all parts of the city.

Staff development is an ongoing and active enterprise at Dorchester High School. In addition to citywide inservice sessions, professional conferences and workshops, the school has enlisted the help of the New England Telephone Company to provide resources for training for administrators. Teachers at the school have provided leadership in computer literacy and computer use courses for other teachers across the city and the school is used each semester for college-level courses. Another source of professional development opportunities for teachers in the District V Teacher Center and the University of Massachusetts Secondary School Improvement Program.

In-house resources are supplemented by access to over fifteen community agencies to support the school's efforts in counseling, job placement, and social services.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement is built through a series of Parent Nights scheduled through the year. The school hosts an annual Parent Appreciation Night to recognize parents and to honor the school's athletics. Other meetings feature parent-teacher conferences and academic awards. Over 300 parents have turned out through the year.

Summary

Many factors contribute to the effectiveness of Dorchester High School's programs. Among them are a seriousness of purpose among members of the school community, high expectations conveyed directly and often to students, parents, and teachers, strong administrative support for basic skills, intensive, coordinated efforts to improve academic achievement, and school priorities that emphasize the needs of all learners--the remedial as well as the gifted.

School: JAMAICA PLAIN HIGH SCHOOL (9-12)

Jamaica Plain High School has shown dramatic gains in student achievement in math and reading for minority and low income students as a result of systemwide and local efforts that emphasize academic performance as a major indicator of school effectiveness. The school's racial-ethnic profile closely matches the district's norm and reflects the various groups that make up the broader Jamaica Plain community. Achievement in reading and math surged last year at most grade levels and student attendance improved from 74.8 to 80.2 percent. Jamaica Plain High School is marked by a high degree of synergy that has enabled administrators and teachers to shape existing resources into new and interesting combinations to support the school's goals.

Overview

Jamaica Plain High School offers both college and career preparatory programs, including courses in computer education, graphic arts, industrial arts, power/energy studies, home economics and business education. The school is the site of a large Spanish

bilingual program and is part of the School-based Management Project. Pairing support comes from Simmons College, Boston Gas Company, and Travelers' Insurance. A number of community agencies collaborate with the school to provide additional resources, including MassPEP, a program to prepare minority students for careers in engineering, the School-aged Parenting Program, City Stage, Faulkner Hospital, and the Private Industry Council.

Curriculum and Organization

Jamaica Plain High School found a strong echo for its own expectations for students in citywide curriculum objectives in mathematics and English and has effectively implemented them for all students. A climate of high expectations is consciously created among students, teachers, and parents by a clear administrative message that "all children can learn." Organized into houses, the school manages to maintain a personalized approach to students' academic and social needs. A reading lab, a RIF program, and comprehensive tutoring services further support the academic program.

Special Programs/Resources

A key ingredient in the success of Jamaica Plain High School's programs is a strong team spirit among administrators and teachers. A small group at the school participate in the University of Massachusetts' training program for school teams. The focus of the course is on practical school issues that have immediate relevance for team members. By emphasizing climate, curriculum, evaluation, and other areas targeted for improvement by the headmaster, the convene of the group, the team has become a vehicle for accomplishing the school's goals and for developing a problem-solving approach to school management.

The MassPEP and Challenge programs as well as special in-house and community-based tutoring programs are added resources for the school's range of learners. A special Carnegie Challenge Grant is enabling 100 students to work on oral history projects that bring in community people as resources. A strong student leadership program gives students opportunities to feel ownership for school goals and to plan and conduct school activities, such as a recent Alumnae Party as well as receptions for the many organizations that collaborate with the school.

A comprehensive test awareness program, initiated last year and continued through this current school year, involved all students in the school in practicing strategies to improve their performance on standardized tests. In addition, teachers showed special dedication and commitment by tutoring students before and after school, assisting them with special projects, and writing grants to purchase high-quality, up-to-date materials.

School-based Management, a school department program for increasing accountability and responsibility at the building level, was piloted at Jamaica Plain High School and resulted in the formation of a school site council to plan and support initiatives for school improvement.

Staff development is accomplished in a variety of ways. In addition to the University of Massachusetts program and citywide inservice sessions, the school has a Teacher Center with the latest professional journals, an affiliation with Harvard's Principal's Center, and the resources of Simmons College, considered an exemplary university partner. In addition, a monthly curriculum newsletter provides updates on teaching strategies and ideas.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement is actively sought and is built into many school planning efforts. The many steering committees and subcommittees that are organized around every major school program all have parent members. A newsletter for Hispanic parents, computer workshops, special performances for parents and the community, and panels on parenting supplement scheduled parent-teacher conferences. Over 200 parents attended the first open house of the school year.

Summary

Jamaica Plain High School's successes are the result of strong administrative leadership, clear goals for students, teachers, and parents, high expectations explicitly communicated, and solid efforts to analyze and address problems with attendance and student achievement. By using any and all resources available and building a tight network of professional support, the school has made impressive strides in providing quality education.

Cambridge

School: FLETCHER SCHOOL (K-8)

The Fletcher is a racially and ethnically diverse K-8 school located between the Mid and East sections of Cambridge along the Somerville line. As one of the system's five formerly minority identifiable schools, the Fletcher has undergone significant changes during the course of desegregation, and currently serves 383 students (65% white and 45% minority) of which 61% receive either free or reduced lunches. The Fletcher is a truly "integrated" school with a diverse mix of students from Black, Hispanic, Portuguese, Irish, Polish, Italian, Greek, and Asian backgrounds. This diversity affects all of our educational activities, and provides the school with a rich and exciting opportunity to gain first-hand knowledge and appreciation of the many cultures of Cambridge and, indeed, of the world itself.

At the Fletcher School, we believe that all parents have a right to expect certain outcomes from the school their children attend, including:

- that their children will always be treated with the highest level of respect and dignity,
- that their children will be taught in a safe and comfortable environment,
- that the school is committed to constantly evaluating its educational program and is willing to make changes as needed in order to enhance the quality of education for each child,
- that the staff and administrators of the school will be available and responsive to parental and community concerns,
- that the school will clearly communicate its educational goals and standards to all parents and students, and
- that teachers, administrators, parents and students will work together in attaining their shared educational goals.

The above expectations are the basis for the operation of the Fletcher School.

In every aspect of our educational program, we strive to foster learning in a truly multicultural mode. For example, we have selected our reading materials so that children will learn of the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of their friends. We study the music and dance of the countries from which our children or their parents have come. The art work displayed in our school focuses on the folklore and customs of the representative nations. We have begun our annual multicultural dinner which brings together the parents and children of our school for a night of conversation and appreciation of all. We have created an envrironment where all people feel comfortable.

In response to school desegregation, we have analyzed our educational program and determined that the development of a strong language arts program would be our priority. The staff has spent many hours of research and planning and has put in place a program of sequential learning in reading, writing, listening and speaking.

We have introduced a new school-wide reading program, a strong literature program in the upper grades, have begun to develop classroom libraries, have begun to build up our library resources toward development of a first class media center. We have placed emphasis on our writing program. A staff developer has serviced our school for two years in the pursuit of upgrading our writing program. More time is given to the teaching of writing skills and to actual writing by students. The products reflect this commitment by students and staff.

We have attempted to keep up with the state of the art in computer technology. Among the many things we have done in this area are to collaborate with private industry and the local universities. We have been associated with T.E.R.C. (Technical Education Research Centers), Bolt, Baranek and Newman, Inc., Project Business and Harvard University. We have alo been assisted by the Cambridge School Volunteers who have provided us with university students who have worked with our students.

We have, this year, the services of a Staff Developer who is supporting our ongoing computer program at all grade levels. We are using this technology in math, science, writing and reading.

Over the past four years, Fletcher students have made consistent and measurable progress in all areas of academic achievement. In particular, the proportion of 8th grade students who have passed the system's

Minimum Skills Competency Test (MSC) has increased 45.6% in Reading and 20.5% in Writing since 1981.

MSC	1981	1984
Math	76.5%	75.0%
Reading	28.6%	74.2%
Writing	48.5%	69.0%

We are, however, constantly seeking new ways, new materials, new associations to continue to make more progress. We communicate this message repeatedly to staff and parents so that our goals are ever present, our focus unblurred and our commitments unwavering.

The parents of the Fletcher School are becoming more involved each year in the overall planning and implemen-tation of the school program. The assignment of a Community-parent Liaison to our school has resulted in outreach to, and response by our parents. The parents and staff meet on a regular basis. This association has been instrumental, by its combined efforts to bring many improvements to the physical and educational and social environment of the school. In addition, the parents have had successful fund-raisers, the proceeds of which have been donated to the school to enhance its educational plan.

Although it sounds trite, the road to success is not an easy one. It takes a great deal of work, and interest, and time, and love to overcome the obstacles and frustrations one faces in pursuit of excellence. This road may be never-edning, but, along the way each success is a stimulus to continue. If we were to give advice to any school in their effort to become an effective school, we would suggest that you make the school climate comfortable, compatible and supportive; that you repeatedly, by example and articulation, make your goals clear; that you give support and recognition to those who have the commitment; and that you have the courage and wisdom to constantly evaluate what you are doing and to make change where indicated.

School: MORSE SCHOOL (K-8)

1. **Why Should Minority and Majority Race Parents Voluntarily Enroll Their Children in This School - What Makes This School Attractive to Parents?**

The Magnet Theme of the Morse School stresses the basic skills - with flexibility within the classroom, so that the individual needs of the child can be

met. We believe that a solid foundation must be in place so that creativity can be fostered. We want to see the development of the child academically and creatively and also bring about a greater awareness of the contribution of all people to the family of man.

Our reason for existence is the development of the "whole child" intellectually and psychologically. This "whole child" concept is the beacon always kept in view by the Morse School Staff as it strives to educate its children. We feel we are an attractive school because:

a) The principal is an active leader in the school and community.
b) An orderly climate exists - brought about democrati-cally - through fairness, equity and warmth.
c) An emphasis on basic skills and the development of greater human understanding through the awareness of the contribution of others (Multicultural Education).
d) Standardized Tests to measure those skills.
e) Teachers - who not only have a knowledge of their subject matter, but teach with warmth, affection and possess high expectations for all students and are actively involved in the school and community.
f) Follow-up survey of graduates, formally and informally as to success or not and why.
g) Last, but not least, active and participating parents. The Morse School involves administrtators, teachers, children, parents and staff working together to achieve all of the above.

2. **What Efforts Are Made to Encourage Parents to Voluntarily Enroll Their Children in This School?**

Enrollment, it must be kept in mind, is coordinated by the Parent Information Center. Assignments are based upon Parent choice within the parameters of the citywide racial balance plan. (There must be equity in the assignment of pupils.)

a) Our Parent Liaison is assigned to the Morse School and can be reached Monday through Thursday. She is directly responsible to the citywide Parent Coordinator. The Liaison's function is to assist in the organization of parents in the school; participate as required at parent training sessions and workshops; participate in regular staff meetings and

individual supervisory sessions; act as a conduit of information from the school department to the parents and from parents to the school department. She explains desegregation policies and procedures to parents, assists in the recruitment and registration of parents, works as an advocate for, and a link to parents, attends selected meetings of the School Committee. The Parent Liaison participates in outreach to parents of potential kindergarteners and new first grade students, helping to register them during the special registration periods. She prepares a monthly newsletter to communicate events to parents and a monthly coffee hour for parents and staff. She helps parents develop a healthy home and school partnership and works with the Parent Teacher Organization.

b) We have an active P.T.O. - which supports our school, teachers and programs. They also encourage parents' participation in school by their becoming members and actively involved in school programs.

3. **How Has Voluntary Desegregation Impacted The Way Parents Interact with This Sschool - Formal and Informal Participation?**

First of all our school is open for parental visitation at any time.

We have an active P.T.O. which invites and encourages participation of all parents in supporting and advising on all school policies and functions.

School visitations are coordinated by our Parent Liaison. Visitations are encouraged.

Instructional support takes place in the form of instructional aides and staff developers. They not only help in the instruction of basic skills, but also in our approach to Multicultural education. We also encourage community people to visit and instruct or inform us of areas within their expertise.

4. **How Could This School Become More Attractive to Parents?**

We are in dire need of a Computer Lab. We also must improve our Libary facilities by constructing within the existing Library a more aesthetic environment. Last, but not least, we must continue to strive for qualified minority staff members as openings occur.

Our governance structure is democratic with a Principal and a Principal's Assistant. Decisions, as much as possible, are made up of the staff, P.T.O. and students. Our school climate is orderly - enabling instructions to progress at a smooth pace with a limited amount of inter-ruptions as far as discipline is concerned. The staff's creative methods of teaching, plus the constant interaction between school and parents facilitates this type of environment.

Our academic reputation is excellent due to all of the above and influenced by our philosophy:

"The goal of education is not just to increase the amount of knowledge, but to create the possibility for a child to invent and discover: to create men and women who are capable of doing new things."--Piaget

5. **Has Voluntary Desegregation Improved The Quality of Education for Minority and Low Income Students in This School?**

Yes - for it has enriched the school with many different children with a wide variety of ethnic and racial backgrounds. All over, children are participating in our Multicultural education program and contributing information about their ethnic and racial groups.

Analysis of the 1983-84 Basic Skills Test results shows that by eighth grade, low income students in the Morse School are scoring higher than both regular education and low income students systemwide:

	% Passed		
	Morse	Regular Ed. All Schools	Low Income All Schools
Math	89	82	74
Reading	89	80	69
Writing	78	58	45

6. **If Another School in Your System Was Considering Becoming A Magnet School - What Advice Would You Give Them?**

I would be in favor of it - for it provides a common ground, which all community members (administration, staff, parents and students) develop together as a team.

School: PEABODY SCHOOL (K-8)

1. **Why Should Parents Enroll Their Children in This School - What Makes The Peabody An Effective School?**

The Peabody is compassionate, humane, and believes that all children can and must learn. The Peabody's "magnet" theme is entitled Academics Plus. Academics Plus is a blueprint for cooperative action between parents and teachers. The end result of this cooperative action is quality education for all children. The Academics Plus program will define for parents in clear terms; the Academic Philosophy of the school and those attendent policies (Homework, attendance, discipline, etc.) that undergird academics. It will also describe in detail current programs that support the instructional program. Furthermore it will detail and highlight an array of new and exciting programs that will be incorporated in school year 1985-86. These new programs will meet the needs of our diverse student population. The Peabody School believes that the Academics Plus Program will empower parents and teachers. This empowerment process, we predict will lead to mutual investment in the Peabody's School Renaissance. We consider the Peabody to be a attractive school because:

a) It accomodates various learning styles by having varying teaching styles incorporated within the school and matching whenever possible learning style with teaching style.

b) The Academics Plus Magnet will unveil interesting programs such as:

- mentor program for gifted and talented students
- a literature/writing project for students in grades 2, 3 and 4
- an exciting computer literacy program for all students K-8

These and other programs enhance our school's instructional agenda.

c) One of the Peabody's strengths lies in its school climate. The Peabody School is safe and friendly. Our year-long theme is mutual respect. The Peabody PTO and staff plans and implements schoolwide activities designed to maintain a warm school climate.

d) The Peabody School has been successful in establishing collaborative relations with

community resources. Harvard, M.I.T., Lesley College, Cambridge Guidance Center and the McDonald's Corporation just to name a few. These and other resources have agreed to share their resources with the Peabody School. We believe that good schools make for good communities and good communities help to create good schools.

e) The Peabody School has long had a tradition of academic excellence. Whereas the community of the school is diverse and reflects richness of the Cambridge community, this is especially exciting. In our minds the essence of education is to have students of all backgrounds learning, playing and working together within a climate that fosters quality education.

f) As principal, I believe in open dialogue and communication. As often as I can I attempt to encourage consensus. If consensus cannot be reached then as the building and instructional leader, I am very willing to make what I hope to be well considered decisions. The Peabody is a democratically run school and thrives very well with committee participation.

g) Our Philosophy of Education extols the Primary of Children. It is the fundamental responsibility of parents and teachers to provide only the best education for children.

h) Teacher and parent expectations for children attending the Peabody are high yet reasonable. Academic standards are adjusted according to the abilities of our students. However, respect towards others, for self and property is something that we consider non-negotiable. We also encourage students to do their best at all times.

2. **How Do Parents Interact with This School?**

The Peabody School has always had very active parent participation both in formal and informal ways. The PTO is a very integral part of the school fabric and parents are encouraged to join and participate. The school has a dynamic parent liaison who constantly reaches out to the community in order to stimulate parent involvement in our school. She has been quite successful and the numbers of parents who visit and volunteer at the Peaboly has grown. Parents are always welcome if they wish to visit school or observe classrooms. Teachers are encouraged to regularly meet with parents around their children's progress in

school. This is done in addition to regularly scheduled Parent-Teacher evening meetings. As Principal, I regularly call parents to share school information or to make comments on children's progress. We also attempt to maintain a consistent process of information sharing other than word of mouth. We have a regular monthly school newsletter that goes to every parent and have recently established The Peabody Line which can be called after school hours for school information, dates, etc.

3. **Do You Encourage Parent Participation in This School and Do You Feel that This Involvement Makes A Difference in The Effectiveness of The School?**

The staff and administration believe that a significant percentage of the Peabody's success is directly attributed to parent participation in the school. Knowledgeable and supportive parents can make a real difference. Our aim for school year 1985-86 is to share with every Peabody parent the Academics Plus blueprint. We want parents to scrutinize its context, make suggestions for implementation and to support its aims. We truly believe that it will serve as a vehicle to empower parents and teachers. Furthermore, parents will be recruited to volunteer in various curricula areas of the school's program. For example our proposed Literacy Center will require involvement and participation. In summation, parent participation is vital to the Peabody School.

4. **Has The Quality of Education Improved for Minority and Low Income Students in This School, and How Do You Account for This Success?**

In my estimation the quality of education for minority and low income students has improved. Much of this can be directly attributed to the school's campaign to generate a positive, safe, and supportive learning environment. Since September much effort has been expended to establish a good climate and learning environment. Our premise being that a nurturing climate built on mutual respect is one ingredient towards student success. In addition, much energy has gone into instructional strategies to bolster the quality of education for minority and low income students. At present we have a basic skills monitoring team that looks closely at the progress of students below grade leve, many of which are minority or poor. Teachers, parents and the building principal discuss ways to improve services that are necessary for student achievement.

The Peabody school's classroom teachers, learning disability teachers and Title I terachers maintain an open channel of communication around student achievement and ways to improve it.

We are presently one of six schools piloting the Degrees of Reading Power program. We believe that this program will assist us in improving the comprehension skill of all students.

5. **If Another School Had A Similar Student/Parent Population, What Concrete Advice Would You Give Them in Making That School An Effective Desegregated School?**

Tip number one for any school desirous of becoming effectively desegregated is to establish a trust relationship between teachers and parents. It is crucially important that both groups remain targeted on some worthwhile goal, i.e., quality education for each and every child. To this end steps should be taken to bring the groups together in non-threatening forums. Social endeavors are usually the most effective way to generate alliances. Once the "critical mass" is developed and a working partnership is underway, goals and objectives and strategies to implement them must be stated. Clear communication and consistency is essential at every phase of this process. All parties must be informed. In my opinion barriers of difference can be eliminated if a school is willing to invest time and energies to work with pa.ents and communities. I sincerely believe that neither parent nor teacher can argue with the premise that "All Children Can and Must Learn." A goal such as this has to be the bottom line for schools that want to become effective.

Holyoke

School: MAURICE A. DONAHUE SCHOOL (4-6)

The M. A. Donahue School Faculty has always aimed at creating an educational environment that students want to be a part of. Donahue School is a good place to be. A key factor to this environment is communication. Communication among all faculty enhances the educational development of all our students.

A majority of our faculty have attended T.E.S.A. (Teacher Expectation Student Achievement) workshops which have made them more aware of student needs, wants and capabilities. In addition, faculty members have attended workshops which were geared at sensitizing people to other people of differing racial, ethnic or cultural backgrounds. All of this has helped the faculty of Donahue meet the changing integration that has been successful at Donahue School.

The physical structure of Donahue School, with an open library in the center of the school and walls between classes which can be opened, has enhanced opportunities for classes to have integrated activities. Last year, Chapter I Language Arts Students were able to put on the play "The Headless Horseman," with a Spanish bilingual element. With the aid of parents, parts were translated into Spanish and incorporated into the play with all students understanding what was being said. This was a very good example of integration being a true learning process.

As mentioned above, parents are an important part of Donahue School. Conferences are held twice a year, at which time, teachers and parents discuss students progress. An Open House was held this fall in the evening and was well attended. Parents are encouraged to be active participants in their child's education. Our Outreach Worker has helped parents learn how they can aid their children with homework. The doors of Donahue are always open to parents.

Below I will list other activities available to all students at the Donahue School. It should be noted that each of these are intertwined with the academic progress of each student.

1. **Margaret Robison**, (Poet in Residence). Last year the students at Donahue published a book of poems by each and every student. This year, Margaret has continued to develop writing skills with our students but has added the element of ageism. Students are visiting patients at H.G.A. and sharing thoughts of life; life of 60, 70 years ago and life of today; life of dreams fulfilled or failed; life of dreams, yet to be.

2. **Richard Moss**, (Artist in Residence). Richard is new to our school this year, but has already shown students the need for sequential thinking skills and given them the feelings of pride and

accomplishment when seeing a concept develop to a finished product, of their own creation.

3. **Computers**-Our present grade 6 is being given instruction with computers, twice a week. Next year we hope to expand this program to include the fifth grade.

4. **Hitchcock Center for the Environment**-Students in the fifth grade have been aided in their science instruction by people from the Hitchcock Center. Trips outside to the fields and streams surrounding the school have given students Hands On Experience with the environment around them.

5. **Holyoke Geriatric Authority**-The location of the H.G.A. at our backdoor has given our students many opportunities to share special events with the elderly. Holidays are especially lonely for the elderly. Our classes have shared the festivities of Halloween, Thanksgiving and Christmas, with our senior neighbors. Velentine's Day festivities among seniors and Donahue School students were televised over our local T.V. Station, Channel 22. The community was able to see happiness on the faces of their loved ones.

6. **Folk Singers**-This is the second year all students at Donahue School have had the opportunity to work with Folk Singers. The program has a singing component and cultural heritage component. Students have inter-viewed teachers, parents and other students to gain knowledge of the various cultures, which are within our community. A journal with songs, recepies, rhymes and family histories, is in the process by each student.

7. **After School Activities**-One day a week, students voluntarily remain at Donahue School to work with Margaret Robison, on their poetry, Guy Barnett, a sixth grade teacher, on photography and Bill Benedict, a member of the Desegregation Staff, to play basketball and become attuned to good sportsmanship.

School: KIRTLAND SCHOOL (K-3)

Kirtland School is a primary school of 300 students, 43% of Hispanic origin. Approximately half of the children are bused to Kirtland as a result of our

voluntary desegregation plan four years ago. With desegregation came the transfer of half of the Kirtland School staff and a deep commitment on the part of the staff to make the plan work successfully.

The principal and teachers set the building goals for the year which included:

- improved effective integrated education
- improved teacher effectiveness
- an instructional environment that would assure maximum achievement for all students

Since all teachers were involved in developing the objectives and activities they felt an ownership in this plan and hold themselves accountable for their successful implementation.

Warmth, friendliness, respect and dignity for everyone create the atmosphere in the school. In the halls, classrooms, playground, and office there are friendly greetings and new students and parents and genuinely welcomed. Student works/projects are exhibited all over the building and bulletin boards are built around student interest. A special bulletin board in the main hall exhibits pictures of students in all places of school life.

Many interesting and varied activites are planned throughout the school year. Such activities as Game Day, Jelly Bean Contest, Marble Contest and Balloon Day are designed to keep the children motivated and eager to come to school while at the same time increasing math and language skills and applying concepts learned. The Literacy Fair is a yearly event involving students, parents and teachers and community resources.

The many facets of community life are incorporated into the daily life of Kirtland School. Some classes are involved in a partnership with a local nursing home ith children making cards and gifts for the senior residents. Vehicle Day saw the arrival of many community cars on our playground. What better way to learn about community helpers then by talking to the people and trying their instruments and riding in their vehicles?

Improving skills (academic or inter-personal) is of prime importance to the people at Kirtland School. Principal and teachers/aides alike are involved in a series of workshops designed to help up work more effectively with children and to help us to change with the times. Teachers learning from teachers in

the building, specially designed language development workshops for Kirtland teachers, TESA as well as workshops for parents are all activities we have chosen to meet our goals.

True integration is always at the back of our minds and in four years we can see some true gains. Hispanic and Anglo children are playing together and mixing more naturally. A game of marbles or tag will find a mixture of faces. There is no name calling or racial undertones on the playground or in the classrooms. All activities are planned so that children will be mixed and make new friends. Playground supervisors encourage all children to join in the games--no one is left on the sidelines.

The activities described do not just happen. Committees are formed within the school. Teachers/aides/parents are encouraged to use their initiative and creativity in coming forth with ideas or when given a problem or idea, to set goals and plan strategies, order materials and generally see an idea through to its successful implementation. Commitment is the key word--commitment to the best interest of the children.

Parents are a vital segment of Kirtland School. While not holding many formal meetings, the P.T.O. is very strong in fund-raising and strongly supportive of teachers and activities at the school. Such activities as the Christmas Bazaar, Balloon Day, Lunch with Principal at McDonald's (monthly), the Opera, Ballet, Magician Authors are just some of the P.T.O. sponsored events.

The Parent Advisory Committee meets monthly with the principal to give imput on parent concerns. This group developed a parent survey sent home in the fall. The results helped to give direction in planning events for the year. A direct result of this survey is a series of two workshops for parents to be held in the evening--one on child abuse and another on stress management.

Parent volunteers have worked diligently in the school library. There is never a lack of chaperones on field trips, or cooks at the picnics or as an audience at assemblies. Constant communication is encouraged between home and school. Notices are sent in English and Spanish and some parents at times volunteer as interpreters. A monthly calendar is sent home keeping parents informed of special activities.

As a result of the "Open Door" policy at Kirtland School parents feel more welcome and at ease when they come to school with problems or concerns. They are invited to any and all activities and because of this they stand in support of the teachers and the school.

Because they are so actively involved in the school their trust and confidence in the school is high. They see what is going on, how hard the teachers work and how concerned they are about all the children. Misunderstandings can and do occur. But the level of involvement of all concerned leads to open and sincere discussion and then to favorable solutions.

Because of the deep concern for the total growth of all children teachers are ever aware of their differences and needs. Group changes are made when necessary, resources are used and help is called for when needed. All children are encouraged to progress at their own pace.

Last year, Kirtland students scored above the citywide average in reading and language, and all third grade students passed the system's basic skills test in reading. To that end the principal and teachers met several times to review test results and item analyses and plan teaching and re-teaching strategies.

A positive self image is most important if children are to achieve to thier maximum potential. Emphasizing the positive, treating everyone with respect and dignity is Kirtland's way of achieving our goal. Our motto and theme song is "Only Love Is Spoken Here."

School: LAWRENCE (4-6)

The Lawrence School has a variety of special programs in which students are homogeneously grouped including: Magnet Science, Spanish as a Second Language, Chapter I Tutoring, Hitchcock Center Science, Computer Education, 5th Grade folklore and family history.

These special programs are designed to enhance the regular education component in reading and mathematics. For example, the Science Magnet program is second to none and very attractive to all the students and their parents. Each student attends Magnet Science and teachers reinforce lessons taught in Science in their homerooms.

As educational leaders we try to instill in our faculty that each child has special qualities that can be developed. Teachers set high expectations for their students and parents are encouraged to communicate with the school personnel and their childen.

Last year's test scores indicate that Lawrence students are on a par with students elsewhere in the city.

Teachers and administrators devote spare time to run an intramural basketball program after school. We feel that this type of activity encourages integration to occur and grow. We also have mini-float contests, handball tournaments and other non-academic activities in which our students participate.

We have an active PTO and PAC. The PTO has grown from no members three years ago to a group of 15 parents. I can see that this number is growing rapidly as the organization has finally come of age. Our PAC consists of eight parents who advise and make recommendations to our principal.

Parents are welcome at any time to visit the school, make suggestions or talk about their children's progress.

Hard work by staff and students has accounted for dramatic improvement of programs and individual students. We hope this trend will continue as we get even better at doing our jobs.

ADDENDUM

HOLYOKE TESTING SUMMARY

Concerning the quality of education with regard to minority students, many of the described activities indicate that access and participation of minority students and parents in the educational process is much improved.

However, in the three years of our comprehensive desegregation plan, achievement test data does not indicate that the gap between majority and minority students has lessened. Both groups seem to be achieving at a level similar to pre desegregation years.

Due to the efforts of the Chapter 636 evaluator, summary data has been compiled and presented to building principals, much of the information has been incorporated in building strategies and we remain optimistic that minority achievement will begin to increase.

We have also begun a comprehensive qualitative project during which we have administered four attitudinal surveys to all third and fourth grade classes. Our intent is to measure the "integration" aspect of our desegregation process. If this "integration" growth can be compared to national norms, some indication of desegregation success may be apparent.

ADVICE TO OTHERS

Involve parents - program, decision making
Create atmosphere of respect and dignity for all people
Employ full-time outreach personnel
Provide many varied activities which enhance regular program
Create partnership with all available councils, agencies, etc.
Provide systematic staff development on cultural and academic issues
Maximize opportunities for integrated activities
Provide opportunities for consistent parent school contact
Set high expectations for all staff and students
Provide opportunities for staff participation in setting, developing and implementing integrative goals
Provide magnet incentives whenever possible.

Lowell

School: CITY MAGNET SCHOOL (K-8)

1. **Why Minority and Majority Parents Find The City School Attractive?**

There are several reasons why the City School attracts students:

a) our unique micro-society curriculum
b) a climate of commitment created by volunteer students and faculty

c) the integrated nature of our school program; parents indicate that they want their children to have an exposure to the "real world" which is multicultural
d) a climate of participation by parents
e) an all-day kindergarten
f) proximity to downtown neighborhoods

2. **Recruitment Efforts**

All systemwide recruitment is conducted out of the Project Director's office. An informational brochure, describing the City School, is available to parents upon request.

Most of the recruitment is accomplished by "word-of-mouth" as students, parents and teachers discuss the City School in their daily lives.

3. **Formal and Informal Participation**

The City School, from its inception, created several formal "participatory structures." For parents, these include a Parent/Teachers Organization, a PTO Executive Committee and the Executive Council.
The PTO holds general business meetings five times per school year. The PTO Executive Committee meets once each month. The School's Executive Council meets once a month.

Each of the three parent participatory structures has policy making responsibilities. The Executive Council, for example, serves as the central "advisory" council to parent, teacher and student councils. It also serves as the coordinating body for communication within the school community.

The formal participation clearly has fostered informal participation. Parents work as secretaries in the school office and they work as advisors in the school's economy.
In addition, parents created and are operating two new City School institutions: the Reading Marathon and the PTO Newsletter. Parents also coordinate all fund raising at the City School.

4. **How The City School Could Be Even More Attractive to Parents?**

There are several ways in which the City School would be an even more attractive choice:

a) an improved physical plant, which will be a reality for September 1986
b) a systemwide magnet school program, rather than the seven school magnet school network; this would foster a climate for choice
c) additional positive public relations in the local media

5. **How The City School Is Different?**

a) The unique micro-society curriculum. We believe that experience is the best teacher. Rather than an adult-oriented subject matter, we enable students to create and operate their own small society. Many of the institutions that operate in the society outside of school are reproduced at the City School. The difference is that our students are legitimate and enfranchised citizens of their own society at the City School. Students develop and operate their own government, their own economy and their own publishing enterprises. Through the micro-society process, students learn the "basic skills" and much more.

b) Weekly faculty curriculum workshops. Each week, the faculty meets, either in cluster groups or as an entire faculty, to develop the school's curriculum. As our micro-society curriculum is "alive," it constantly requires changes and adjustments. The curriculum workshops enable us to tame the creature that we have created.

c) Student Governance. As part of the micro-society curriculum, students participate in their own government. They have written, and continue to revise, their own constitution and laws. They operate their own legislature, judicial system (two cluster courts, one Supreme Court), and an executive government bureaucracy (including an IRS, Treasury Department, Department of Labor and Commerce, the City School Crime Stoppers, and a Department of Justice).

d) Parent Participation. The nature of parent participation at the City School is very different. Parents have been invited into the process of developing and operating a school. Parents contribute to meaningful policy formulation through the formal and informal participation at the City School.

e) Parent/Teacher cooperation. At the beginning of each year, the "Home/School Partnership" agreement goes home to each parent. Parents comment on the agreement and then sign it, indicating that they support the principles enclosed. Parents and teachers then work throughout the year to implement this agreement.

6. **Quality of Education for Minority and Low Income Children**

The City School's micro-society is an equal opportunity society. In both the Government and Economy sectors of the micro-society, minority and low income children have taken on leadership positions in percentages greater than their population at the school. For example, in three of the first four legislatures, minority children have been elected to the top two leadership positions. Many of our most successful businesses are minority businesses.

Yet, while there have been great successes, there also seems to be a definite relationship between school basic skill achievement and students' socio-economic background. This school year, we have created a vehicle that seeks to address this problem. Our Reading Marathon seeks to identify students who are not reading or are not being read to, and provide additional resources to these children and their parents.

We are also in the midst of a planning process, evaluating the manner in which reading is taught in our school. Led by our program facilitator, the goal is to establish new strategies that will enable every student in the school to achieve at grade level. Of course, any new strategies will be in the context of our micro-society curriculum.

Therefore, while we have achieved some success in the education of minority and low income children, the process that is ongoing in our school allows us to continue to develop more effective strategies with this population. It continues to be one of our major objectives.

7. **Advice to Other Schools Considering Becoming Magnet Schools**

I am a strong proponent of a school system composed totally of magnet schools. This allows parents a complete choice of the type of school their children will attend.

An all magnet school system will infuse a degree of competition for students, which can only help improve the entire system.

The additional resources available to magnet schools is another important reason to become one. The staff development made possible through magnet funds is one of the key elements in improving communication and developing a more effective school program.

School: ROGERS MAGNET SCHOOL (K-8)

Almost every parent seeks success for her or his child as an educated, humane person able to function in a complex pluralistic society. The E. N. Rogers Magnet School provides the basic skills of a successful education in a fundamental way within a student body that reflects all areas of the city demographically, as well as, its rich and diverse cultural composition.

The experience and dedication of staff, leadership of administration, support and involvement of parents has enabled Lowell's first magnet school to achieve the lofty goals set in the inaugural phase of voluntary desegregation planning and implementation. This pioneering effort has gained qualitative and quantitative success. Parents may choose a school that is not only attractive because of its program offerings, core curriculum, and methods that are academically successful, but does so in a setting that incorporates and enhances the benefits of a city's multi-cultural make-up, while making allowance for the nurturing and caring for the child as an individual human being.

While the City of Lowell's Voluntary Reduction of Minority Isolation Plan of April 8, 1981, provides for parents to select schools in a formal application process, an active program of recruitment is carried out by the Magnet Schools Project Director's office. In addition, specifically for the Rogers School, all phone inquiries are treated courteously and invitations are extended to visit the school and observe its operation. Possible volunteer parents and students are given a tour of the physical plant, observation of classes and teachers that will impact on the student if he/she decided to enroll; introduction to the administrative staff; a brochure describing the school's programs and the Parent Handbook developed by the parents and staff of the school. The school tries to publicize its endeavors

in a positive way through the media in order to keep parents aware of its availability as an attractive educational choice.

The archetypical inner-city school [illegible] almost non-existent parental involvement exis[illegible] prior to the Rogers School becoming a magnet school. Today, the necessity and wisdom of having active parents has contributed to the growth and success of the school.

The inclusion of parents in the process of selecting a magnet school concept solidified the choice when administration, staff, as well as parents chose a fundamental learning approach to education. Parents not only participated in the school's philosophical roots, but took part in the incorporation of the governing structure and policy from its inception. The school's policies and procedures are delineated in the Parent's Handbook. Revision of policy and procedures are made, if necessary, by assessing parents, staff, and administration.

Voluntary desegregation efforts have sought positive interaction of parents with the school to the benefit of all concerned parties. For example, monthly meetings held by the PTO take place where none previously existed. Representatives to the City Wide Parent Planning Council presents the views of the Rogers School Community. Parent volunteers staff our System80 Lab. A formal open house takes place yearly, but parents are encouraged to have regular contact with the school. Chapter 636 proposal input and review are solicited at PTO meetings, through written communication and [illegible]elephone response.

Parents particip[illegible]e in fund-raising activities where none had ever taken place and now contribute significant support. Parental participation in field trips, and other school activities, [illegible]as minimal to moderate previously, now a high degree of confidence has been established for needs to be met when parents' support will make an educational difference.

4. The addition of a full-time kindergarten, a first grade readiness class, an after-school tutorial program, better bus discipline, elimination of discipline problems, more parental involvement are improvements which parents have cited and would make the school more attractive to parents.

5. A teacher directed core curriculum which focuses on the basic skills of reading, writings, reasoning,

mathematics, and responsibility constitute the basis of the fundamental learning approach. With support from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Chapter 636, the school has been able to provide additional means of upgrading the students' skills.

Lowell's finest elementary computer program adds to students learning and achievement. The System80 lab, staffed by parents, enables our newly immigrated students, as well as those students needing remedial services to work toward the goal of grade-level success.

By correlating texts, teaching, computers, System80 with the results of the Individual Criterion Referenced Test a goal-oriented process is created to achieve academic success. From an average of two years below grade level, when we initially became a magnet school, we have almost reached parity with grade level for the overall student population.

In addition to these fundamental learning support systems, The Rogers offers a unique Environmental Education program to apply and enrich the basic skills. From Kindergarten through Eighth Grade each student takes part in class activities and on-site field work.

Working with outside resources has enabled the school to gain rich rewards with no financial obligation. The University of Lowell's Health Profession and Music Department gain needed experience and exposure for their students, while offering supplemental programs to the school. St. John's Hospital, Lowell General Hospital, Massachusetts Electric Company, and Colonial Gas are resources utilized to advantage. Lowell's National Park, the Commonwealth's State Heritage Park, the Department of Environmental Management, Greater Lowell Indian Cultural Association are some of the resources included as part of the school's curriculum adjuncts.

A program facilitator allows for greater parental liaison, staff development, and program implementation and evaluation. While regular administrative supervision is in place, only two other schools staff a full-time program facilitator modeled on the prototype, initiated and continued at the Rogers Fundamental Magnet School.

By being a magnet school, the rewards that have accrued have created a more dynamic institution able

to provide greater academic achievement and a positive atmosphere. Teachers feel that innovation is much more possible because financial and personnel support will be provided. Students find it more exciting and have a greater opportunity to learn with the provision of more resources. Parental apathy and disassociation has been displaced with concern and commitment.

Newsletters, calendars, written communication, media attention, supplemental material, content area field trips, professional puppet shows, theatre groups, movies, environmental education programs, a fife and drum corps, string instrument lessons, outside visitations and performances, ULowell laboratories, Parent-Teacher Center, Parent-Teacher Organization, teacher and parent workshops, professional days, external resources and personnel, fund-raising activities, inter-group responsibility for testing results, curriculum innovation, curriculum additions, program facilitator, and parental volunteers . . . unequivocally, voluntary desegregation has improved the quality of education for minority and low income students.

Without qualification, become a magnet school. The positive benefits far outweigh the responsibilities and obligations inherent in being a magnet school. First, seek a consensus of staff, parents and administration on the concept and philosophy for the school. Choose a dynamic person to be responsible for its implementation. Proceed with the cooperation and backing of administration, faculty, and parents. Have patience with the process, and a willingness to continue to work towards those set goals.

Medford

The Brooks/Hobbs Magnet School represents an expansion of the original Hervey/Brooks K-6 Magnet School program. The Brooks/Hobbs program is now in its first year of operation.

1. **Why Should Minority and Majority Race Parents Voluntarily Enroll Their Children in This Sschool? What Makes This School Attractive to Parents?**

The Brooks/Hobbs Magnet School is a racially balanced multicultural learning environment which provides both a traditional basic skills curriculum and many innovative educational programs and activities. Computer education, Multi media developmental classroom, All day kindergarten, Small class size, Door to door transportation, Expanded Science and Creative Arts programs along with a special Parent Program Center make this program very attractive.

2. **What Efforts Are Made to Encourage Parents to Voluntarily Enroll Their Children in This School?**

Program incentives planned for the Magnet Program are widely advertised. Systemwide publicity both through the media and parent groups provide interested parents with information and encouragement to explore the Magnet School as a viable option for their children.

3. **How Has Voluntary Desegregation Impacted The Way Parents Interact with This School? Formal and Informal Partici-pation? Parent Councils, School Visitations, and Instructional Support?**

The establishment of a Parent Center and a Magnet Advisory Board along with the traditional P.T.A. programs have enabled parents to take an active role in the planning, development and governance of the school program. Also, specially planned programs allow opportunities for parents to learn along with their children.

4. **How Could This School Become More Attractive to Parents?**

The development of additional options and the continued development of program activities will enhance parent enthusiasm and perception of the program. Renovations to the expanded Brooks/Hobbs facility would also create a more flexible physical environment and support additional attractive programs.

5. **How Does This School Differ from Other Schools in The System? (Please describe this in Operational, specific terms) Teaching and Learning Style; Special Programs; Governance Structure; School Climate; Academic Reputation; External Resources; Philosophy of Education?**

The Magnet School provides more interactive parent involvement which enables students, teachers,

administrators and parents to develop solutions to issues and programs which can advance both the format and the nature of the School program. In this complex there is also more than one class for each grade K-6. This provides both for small classes and flexibility in teaching/learning styles. The grant-assisted special programs put this program at the cutting edge of new technology and educational opportunity. There is a greater ability to implement programs that are discretionary rather than mandatory during this age of economic scarcity.

6. **Has Voluntary Desegregation Improved The Quality of Education for Minority and Low Income Students in This School?**

Voluntary desegregation has provided an integrated learning format which has brought many committed families from throughout the district together with minority and low income students. Such peer group interaction is a positive influence for all participating personnel.

7. **If Another School in Your System Was Considering Becoming A Magnet School, What Advice Would You Give Them?**

A Magnet School must be preplanned based on a full assessment of population and program needs. "Major emphasis should be given to the development of parent advisory committees to develop a sense of ownership in the program." Programs should spell out clear goals and objectives and set sound responsibility and duable timetables. Program resources should be carefully calculated and allocated to promote effective results. The parent involved advisory committees should work closely with program staff so that expectations are consistent with reality and all participants are on the same wave length. While each program should have themes which attract students, each should remember the basic educational mission of a public school. Outreach and dissemination efforts should be comprehensive so as to encourage full participation and understanding of the program goals initiatives.

Springfield

School: SAMUEL BOWLES ELEMENTARY (K-4)

Samuel Bowles Elementary School currently enrolls 385 students in grades K-4. Though located in a predominantly white neighborhood, the school has had a steadily increasing influx of minority students, particularly Hispanic students, and is presently a white minority school with a racial distribution of 44% white, 32% non-white, and 34% Hispanic. Both the percentage of minority students and the percentage of low income students (56%) are above the citywide average.

During this rapid change in the composition of our student body since 1974 (i.e., from 3% Hispanic in 1974 to 34% today), Bowles has maintained an exceptional record of achievement in an integrated setting. Reading achievement levels at Bowles, according to results of grade 4 citywide testing (CTBS), have been at or above both the national and local norms for each of the past seven years with the average reading level over the seven year span at the 60th percentile. Mathematics achievement levels have been at or above the citywide average in four of the past seven years, averaging at the 50th percentile. Results of our biannual sociometric testing provide evidence of the commitment of our staff to an integrated education as Bowles students have made an ever increasing number of cross-racial selections, from 31% of all selections in 1978 to 51% in 1984. The cross-racial selection rate at Bowles has also been consistently above the citywide average.

We attribute the exceptional achievement and social progress of our students to an outstanding teaching staff, excellent supplementary programs, both remedial and enrichment, and dedicated parents and community volunteers. The teachers at our school operate as a family, continually sharing ideas and resources with one another and demonstrating a great deal of caring for all our students and for one another. Supplementary programs, such as Chapter 636, enable us to better meet the needs of students at both ends of the educational spectrum. One of our Chapter 636

programs, for example, helps to facilitate the progress of students being mainstreamed from the TBE program.

A large number of parents of present and former Bowles students, former school employees, and other volunteers, often numbering over 50 per week, provide a conscientious and reliable means of support for our classroom teachers. In addition to providing tutoring services, these volunteers help to maintain our school library, listen to oral book reports, perform clerical tasks, and coordinate fund-raising activities to support our six annual scholarships and to fund supplementary classroom materials, field trips, and performances. Through continuous efforts of all our staff to make our parents and volunteers feel welcome and appreciated and to have "ownership" in our building, beginning with the first day of enrollment, we are able to maintain one of the most active parent volunteer organizations in the city.

We also feel that the organizational structure, as carried out by classroom teachers, support staff, and volunteers, is a factor in our success. In our organizational plan, the entire school groups for reading and math at the same time. Further, the reading block is divided into two separated time periods to encourage greater time on task and better utilization of volunteers and support staff. Group sizes vary, depending upon reading or math levels, and are flexible, depending upon the continuously evaluated progress of our students.

In our opinion, the best advice we can offer for establishing an effective integrated educational program is to adopt and communicate a sound philosophy of education, to involve teachers, parents, and the total community in carrying out that philosophy, to set high expectations for success, and to establish an atmosphere that promotes that success for every child. By providing a lot of "tender loving care," by providing individualized attention through extensive use of support staff and volunteers, by continually stressing respect for self and for one another, by promoting the school as a "community" or family in which all parties have a responsibility for one another, the atmosphere conducive to success can be established. Such an atmosphere is what we have tried to provide at Bowles, together with the necessary support of parents and the community as a whole.

School: HOMER STREET SCHOOL (K-4)

Homer Street School is one of the original racially imbalanced inner-city schools that led to the establishment of the Six-District Desegregation Plan. Homer currently enrolls 363 students in grades K-4 of whom 28% are white, 62% non-white, and 10% Hispanic. As most of our kindergarten students are bused to other schools for grades 1-4, our grade 1-4 population is 44% white, 43% non-white, and 13% Hispanic. Almost three-fourths of our total school population (55% in grades 1-4) are classified as low income students.

Despite the preconceived notions many people have concerning inner-city schools, Homer has consistently offered an effective educational program in an integrated setting. For example, on the CTBS Achievement Tests given in grade 4 every October for the past seven years, Homer has regularly been among the top scoring schools. In each of the seven years, our achievement scores in both reading and math have been at or above both the national and local norms. The average student at Homer over this seven year span has been at the 65th percentile in reading and at the 62nd percentile in math. Sociometric testing results provide sound evidence that the educational program at Homer is truly integrated. The percentage of friendships formed at Homer that are cross-racial has been consistently above the citywide average and has shown steady progress, increasing from 33% in 1978 to over 50% in the most recent testing.

There is no single factor that is responsible for the success at Homer, but certainly one of the most important reasons for this success is the excellent teaching staff. The teachers at Homer are true professionals, very caring, and very interested in improving their skills to he utmost benefit of the youngsters. Each teacher is observed at least seven times during the year in a variety of teaching modes. Suggestions for improvement, if warranted, are offered. In addition, at least ten faculty meetings each year are devoted to professional development. Finally, test results each year are carefully scrutinized and, if weaknesses are found in any area of the curriculum, changes are made.

A second factor contributing to successful achievement at Homer is the effective utilization of all available resources. For example, Chapter I and Chapter 636 staff are teamed for reading and math in a "Round

Robin" remedial instruction and reinforcement program which has proven to be one of the most successful Chapter 636 basic skills programs, and has resulted in increased time on task and lower pupil-teacher ratios for all students regardless of ability levels. The counseling staff is also utilized to the fullest extent as a high proportion of our students are referred for phychological testing or counseling in order to obtain as much information as possible to enable us to provide the most beneficial educational program for aech of our students.

A third factor important to the success at Homer is the high standards of expectation set in both achievement and behavior for all students and the communication of those standards to parents. Visitors to Homer will find a quiet, structured, well-organized building with students and teachers on task. All parents are invited, early in the school year, to "Meet Your Teacher Night." At this time the expectations of the school in general and of the teachers in particular are explained to parents. Parents, once aware of the high standards that are expected, are highly supportive of the efforts of the teachers to demand the best from their children, and are encouraged to become involved in the education of their children. Beginning with the first day of school, parents are informed verbally and in writing that they are free to visit the school or their children's classrooms at any time. Parents are also encouraged to become active in the PTO or to volunteer their time and talents, particularly in enrichment areas.

Another factor in our success is the support given to teachers and parents. For example, as a sign of their appreciation for the efforts of classroom teachers, the PTO has not only provided money for teachers to purchase classroom materials but has also acknowledged the efforts of teachers with gifts of draperies and a microwave oven for the teachers' lounge and with a gift for every teacher at the end of the school year.

In summary, the key to success in providing effective desegregated education is to establish a sound philosophy of education to communicate that to teachers, parents, and students. The ultimate objective of this philosophy, of course, should be to do the best that is possible for every child, utilizing to the fullest all the resources that are available. By seeking the best from teachers, students, and parents, this objective can be accomplished.

School: WARNER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (K-4)

Warner Elementary School is one of eight elementary magnet schools in Springfield, currently enrolling 373 youngsters in grades K, 5, and 6 of which 151 are voluntarily enrolled magnet students from all areas of the city. Our present racial distribution is 51% white, 40% non-white, and 8% Hispanic. Though our minority percentage is slightly below the citywide average, the percentage of low income students at our school, 59%, exceeds the citywide average.

We feel that Warner has offered and continues to offer a highly effective integrated educational program for all our students. Results from citywide achievement testing and sociometric testing over the past several years confirms this. For example, reading achievement levels at Warner have been above the citywide average for each of the past seven years and above the national norm for the past six years on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills given in grade 6 every October. In 1976, though above the city average, our students were reading at only the 44th percentile. On the most recent CTBS testing, our students were reading at the 66th percentile. Mathematics achievement has also consistently been above the city average, improving from the 41st percentile in 1976 to the 60th percentile in the most recent testing. Sociometric testing results indicate that our efforts to promote racial integration are working. The percentage of student friendship selections that were cross-racial on the sociograms has increased from only 24% in 1978 to 53% in 1984.

There are several reasons why our program has been so effective. Our organization of self-contained classrooms, for example, enables a more multidisciplinary approach to the basic skills and also enables teachers to better diagnose student strengths and weaknesses and to establish greater rapport with the students. Reading and language arts are continually stressed throughout the day culminating in a 20-minute sustained silent reading period every day. Opportunities are also available for special enrichment experiences in reading, mathematics, computer programming, art, and music. These special activities, together with small group activities within our self-contained classroom organization help to foster student friendships and the development of a positive self-image.

A second major reason for the success of our program is consistency among the staff in our expectations for

students in both achievement and behavior. While varying in their individual teaching styles, our teachers are consistent in their attempts to promote our school-wide goals of greater self-motivation, self-discipline, self-awareness, and self-image. Good citizenship, respect for one another, and manners are continually stressed in every classroom. Each classroom elects a citizen of the month whose picture is displayed in the main corridor for the entire month. These students are also given certificates of accomplishment and are in the running for citizen of the year. Student awards are also given at the end of the year to the most improved students in each class and to students attaining perfect attendance.

Another aspect of our program that is frequently noted by parents and other visitors to our building is the warm, friendly atmosphere. The excellent rapport between teachers and students, for example, is exemplified by our annual teacher-student vollyball game and softball game. Parents and visitors are actively encouraged to become involved in the school, are always made to feel welcome, and are treated with respect by all students and staff. Parents, in addition to parent-teacher conferences, are invited to our monthly multicultural performances and to frequent coffee hours. A large number of parent and community volunteers also contribute countless hours to our school by tutoring students, providing enrichment experiences, and participating in fund-raising activities.

In summary, the secret to providing an effective desegregated educational experience is, as we see it, to provide a warm, friendly, caring environment in which students are treated equally and consistently and in which students can all experience success. Principal, teachers, and parents, working together, can accomplish this.

Worcester

School: BURNCOAT STREET PREPARATORY (K-6)

Why Should Parents Enroll Their Children in This School? What Makes It Effective?

Burncoat Preparatory School has as its primary objective the preparation of its students both academically and socially for success in their future endeavors. A highly dedicated and experienced staff maintains standards of excellence in self-discipline, basic skills, subject matter and sensiivity to others. Parents and staff have worked cooperatively in setting these standards, so that a student's individual intellectual needs are addressed in a healthy classroom atmosphere which recognizes the talents and skills of each child. The uniqueness of the multi-cultural curriculum, the liaison with Quinsigamond Community College, an ongoing fine arts program, interim progress reports and parental academic checklists have resulted from this cooperative effort.

There is a full-time multi-cultural coordinator at Burncoat Prep whose role is to develop an educational curriculum that values racial and ethnic diversity, as well as a sensitivity to the inequities in our society. This curriculum consists of classroom activities, guest speakers and field trips that focus attention on the various ethnic sub-cultures in our society.

Burncoat Prep has established a unique relationship with Quinsigamond Community College which is basically two-fold in nature. The expertise of the college faculty is utilized to provide educational experiences which extend the basic curriculum, such as Anthropology, Computer Literacy, Research Skills, Positive Self-image, Nutrition, Tyoping, etc. In addition, all physical facilities of the college are made available to the students of Burncoat Preparatory School such as the theater (for fine arts presentations), the pool (for certified Red Cross Swimming instruction), the gymnasium, typewriting,

computers, etc. The president of Quinsigamond Community College, Dr. Clifford Peterson, has committed himself and the entire college community to the magnet program at Burncoat Preparatory School.

A fine arts program has been established at Burncoat Preparatory with the objective of providing every student with a theatrical experience several times a year. There is a fine arts consultant responsible for coordinating of the music, choreography and drama for each of these productions.

The support of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with Chapter 636 funds has enabled us to provide our students with the above-mentioned programs.

How Do Parents Interact with The School--Formally and Informally?

From the intial planning stages of Burncoat Preparatory School's magnet program, parents and staff have worked cooperatively on four curriculum committees (Language Arts, Math, Discipline and Mini-course/Multi-cultural) in formulating some of the programs mentioned previously (e.g., the multi-cultural curriculum, fine arts program and Quinsigamond Community College liaison). In addition, the parent-staff committee endeavor has resulted in instituting a five-week interim progress report of each student's growth in the basic skills ares and in the establishment of parental academic checklists which outline a student's individual academic program for a particular school year. A committee of staff and parents has written a student handbook explaining what is expected of each pupil at Burncoat Preparatory. These planning committees continue to meet and evaluate Burncoat Prep's magnet program from year to year.

There are also two formal parent groups which meet monthly at Burncoat Prep.--the P.T.O. and Parent Advisory Council.

Parents assist the school librarian by volunteering to help the students in book selection and simple research skills. There is also a training session being conducted for parents who will volunteer their time to assist in Burncoat's computer program next year.

Informally, parents are very supportive of Burncoat Preparatory as well. Attendance at college mini-course is urged. Parent discussion groups have been formed. Teacher-parent conferences are accommodated to parents' schedules so that communication is open.

3. **Do You Encourage Active Parent Participation in This School and Do You Feel that This Involvement Makes A Difference in The Effectiveness of The School?**

The philosophy of Burncoat Preparatory is such that parents are made aware that education is a joint endeavor of both the home and the school. Parents are kept informed through the P.T.O., the Advisory Council, and newsletters of ongoing and contemplated programs. Feedback from the parents is encouraged.

An open door policy exists where parents who have a concern are encouraged to bring that concern to the school's attention so that appropriate action may be taken.

The support and involvement of the parents at Burncoat Prep. is a major reason for our success in developing the outstanding program which we feel we have.

4. **Has The Quality of Education Improved for Minority and Low Income Students in This School, and How Do You Account for This Success?**

We believe that the quality of education at Burncoat Preparatory has improved for all students. Academic excellence has always been a goal of Burncoat Preparatory. This high standard has not lowered with the development of a magnet school. Low income and minority students have shown significant progress during the past three years. This has been demonstrated by the reduction in the number of children failing minimum competency tests in the 6th grade as compared to the number who failed in the 3rd grade three years ago when our magnet program commenced.

In addition to the academic education the children are receiving the opportunity to interact with various cultures; this enriches their background and prepares them for living in our complex pluralistic society.

5. **If Another School Had A Similar Student/Parent Population, What Concrete Advice Would You Give Them in Making That School An Effective Desegregated School?**

In designing the program for an effective desegregated school it is our experience that the following steps should be taken:

a) Must have adequate planning time (one year)
b) Involvement of parents and staff from the very beginning
c) Continue evaluation of the program by staff, parents and students
d) Staff development/training to raise staff's awareness or sensitivity to others
e) Use community resources in developing programs
f) Provide for a position of a facilitator whose role is to ensure implementation of programs, provide for ongoing evaluation, respond to staff and parent's suggestions for developing and improving programs

School: CANTERBURY STREET MAGNET COMPUTER-BASED SCHOOL (K-6)

We at Canterbury Street Magnet Computer-based School feel that we have developed a program coupled with a learning atmosphere that is beneficial to students and appealing to parents. Through the use of magnet monies we have built a computer program for students that features computer assisted instruction, computer literacy and programming for small groups. While this program was the initial attraction, the ongoing instructional program is strong enough to keep the new students once they have arrived. We have had less than one-half of one percent return to their original school. No one has been asked to return to his/her original school. The staff went through cultural awareness training and the minority students feel welcome here. Using dramatizations, multilingual signs, field trips, teacher written grants in reading designed to increase awareness and insure a smooth transition, have all helped to attain this goal.

Originally, Canterbury Street Magnet was housed in an antiquated building over 100 years old and did not have the physical plant to attract anyone. Now housed in the former Chandler Junior High, we have access to a gym, auditorium, cafeteria and space for our auxiliary programs. Our minority magnet students have blended into our program on a very even level with our original population. They range in academic ability along the whole spectrum from top of the class to near the bottom, with the great majority in the middle third of the classes.

Initial recruiting was done through personal visits to the home school by the principal and staff members and through a brochure sent home to all minority parents from center schools. Now, through word of mouth and the continued success of the program, a waiting list has been established as we have reached a maximum enrollment, a pupil/teacher ratio of 24:1. The school's minority population went from 7% to 35% and has remained constant. Brothers and sisters of students already enrolled are automatically accepted. This occurs mostly in the kindergarten.

The parents have been invited to three open houses so far this year, the day before school, one shortly after school opening, and Know Your Schools Night in November. All three have been well attended, bussing being provided by the Magnet Office. We used these opportunities to explain our school programs and to tour our new school plant.

All parents have been invited to participate in the Mothers' Club, the Parent Advisory Council, to volunteer in the classrooms and attend school functions. Some efforts have been more successful than others, due in part to the traveling distance and a language barrier for the Vietnamese parents. As the children become more and more familiar with the language it is hoped that the parents will come more often, using the children as interpreters.

As we are at capacity enrollment, we will continue to make the school more attractive to parents through expanding programs, although space will be a problem. Grades 1 through 4 have received reading grants this year which have two goals. One to increase reading ability and two, to break down stereotyping in regards to cultural awareness.

As monies become available, it is planned to use a computer that will be used exclusively for statistical and data processing for the magnet student. The program for this has been designed already and we are only awaiting the computer/printer. The program includes everything you could possibly want to know about a student, including his vita, reading materials, group, achievement scores, math achievement, special services accessible to him/her, psychological and intellectual abilities. We feel that achievement and class rank are important to monitor closely to insure that the magnetized student does not end up on the lower end of the achievement spectrum. We work hard to insure that this does not

happen here.

As we expand the reading and math programs toward individualization, it is very important to have the administrative capacity to check on achievement. We can do this through the computer statistical data program.

One problem unique to Canterbury Street is the reading and language levels of the Vietnamese students if they arrive directly from the settlement camps. We reduce the expectancy level and place them in a lower grade for Reading, while supporting them with English as a Second Language tutors. Generally speaking, it takes two years to bring them to grade level. Math does not present the same problem.

Our school, through magnet monies, has been able to acquire the services of a computer expert and aide, a curriculum facilitator, Bilingual aide and a full-time kindergarten teacher. The addition of these personnel has set us apart from other schools. The computer program and a recently acquired computer robot help maintain high interest amongst the students, but the reading and math programs are what make the school attractive and worthwhile to parents.

The classrooms are self contained so that each teacher gets to know each student on an individualized basis. The staff maintains a healthy emotional climate conducive to learning. Discipline is rarely a problem due to the interest of the students in the academic program. A strong code of discipline developed by staff and parents has helped the students to remain within the boundaries of good conduct. Only one fight on the magnet busses in two years bears this out. The school now enjoys a good reputation with many of the Vietnamese and Hispanic parents opting for it over bilingual programs offered in other schools. The philosophy is simple. Like the wind, we cannot see it, only its effects. The children and their education are placed first. Everything else comes second.

Voluntary desegregation has improved the educational climate in the school for everyone involved. Magnet monies has given an opportunity to all the children in the school that would not be available otherwise. In combination with the Chapter 1 programs we have enabled our kindergarten children to test much higher than in recent history. The mixture of cultures has been a positive experience for all. Previously, most

of our local children did not interact with minorities until the Junior High years. The overall reading and math scores have improved and we hope to continue the upward movement.

If another school has the opportunity to develop a magnet program I would suggest that they develop a uniquely different program and one that would have appeal initially to the student and then the parent. I would involve the parents, students and staff in the refinement of goals and how to best achieve them. Once a school becomes involved in the magnet process and has the monies and program available, it is hard to imagine going back to pre-magnet days, yet there is nothing stopping other schools and systems from developing unique programs of their own to attract students to their schools. A vital part of the magnet program should now be to share the experience with other schools on how to best establish an attractive program of their own. This would detract from the feeling that we are siphoning off students from their home areas.

School: CLARK STREET DEVELOPMENTAL LEARNING SCHOOL (K-8)

Effective Desegregation School Profile

1. **Why Should Parents Enroll Their Children in This School? What Makes This School Effective?**

   Parents enroll their children in the Clark Street Learning Developmental School because they are attracted:

   a) by an organizational plan in Reading, language and math which is designed to meet the needs of all students, both advanced and less advanced
   b) special programs
   c) the school atmosphere
   d) opportunity for parent participation
   e) the quality and enthusiasm of the teaching staff

2. **How Do Parents Interact with This School - Formal and Informal Means of Participation?**

   For example: Our parents feel that they are an integral part of the school. Our minority parents who were already in place were familiar with our organizational plan and recognized it as a means of improving their child's education. They were also

involved in the planning stages. They were surveyed in terms of the kind of school program they desired and also participated in the planning workshops. The "magnet" majority parents were also allowed to share in the planning and because they volunteered they were enthusiastic about the special programs and organization. They were also told they would be given the opportunity to actively participate in the life of our school.

FORMAL PARTICIPATION

The Clark Street Advisory Council with open membership - Originally there were two groups, a parent group emphasizing fund raising and direct participation in programs and the advisory council which dealt more directly with the curriculum and input in terms of school problems. However, they eventually decided to function as one advisory group and committee chairpersons were elected to chair the various subcommittees required to assist in improving the school program.

Citywide Planning Council - Two of our parents serve on this council so that Clark Street will have input in regard to the future and philosophy of the Worcester Public Schools. Some have also served on the Magnet Steering Committee.

INFORMAL PARTICIPATION

Again the parents were surveyed and asked to volunteer to participate in various aspects of our program as follows:

a) The library program: Volunteers assist the part-time librarian and are are given flexibility in servicing our students. The library is covered each day.

b) Reading: Parents assist in our reading contests by hearing oral book reports which is invaluable when some of our students read over 50 books in an eight-week period. Some parents also conduct "story hours" for our primary children in particular. They have also recorded on tape chapters from our social studies books to assist the less advanced readers in this area.

c) Arts and Culture: Parents have helped plan some of our cultural events and field trips and serve as chaperones to these events. They also serve as chaperones for parties and dances planned by our student council.

Science

Parents have participated in helping our teachers create a nature trail which now exists and is 1 1/4 miles in length. This required clearing brush, identifying trees and plant life and constructing bird feeders.

Computer

Some parents have served as aides in the computer room and been invaluable to the computer coordinator. Records are maintained for each student and there are many tasks that have to be performed in order to ensure a well organized program.

After School Program

Some parents participate in courses in which they have expertise such as needle point and dancing.

3. **Do You Encourage Active Parent Participation in this School and Do You Feel that This Involvement Makes A Difference in The Effectiveness of This School?**

There is a direct correlation between the upgrading of the school program and school effectiveness in general and parent participation. Children appreciate seeing their parents participate and showing an interest in their school and this has a positive effect on their performance. It also allows the parents to see the teachers and students interacting and this affects the parents' security and feeling about the school.

Parent conferences are encouraged and arranged with convenience in mind and this enables them to recognize the interest that the staff administration have in terms of their child's welfare.

Therefore parent participation is encouraged by both the staff and the administration.

4. **How Does This School <u>Differ</u> from Other Schools in The System?**

Teaching and Learning Style

Most parents look for an educational style that emphasizes the individual needs of the students. The heart of our program is our developmental learning or ability grouping organization whereby students are grouped according to ability in the basics and

strategies are employed to keep the groups as small and homogeneously matched as possible.

Organizational Plan

All students are grouped according to ability in Reading, Language and Math and the morning period is divided into three time blocks. For example, in the first period every teacher on the staff teaches reading. This results in each teacher working with one group only. This eliminates a situation whereby a teacher is working, with one group and other two are performing "seat work." It is immeasurable help to the less advanced student who is enabled to proceed at his own pace with success but also offers to the more advanced student a challenging and accelerated program. It also allows for integration because multi-age groupings and small group situations are employed successfully. A survey of our parents indicated that the organizational plan was the first priority and the key to our programs.

School Atmosphere

The school climate or atmosphere is created through an emphasis on discipline and high standards including the teaching of study habits, consistent homework assignments, acceleration and creating situations where students can work in harmony. For example, since the inception of our magnet program we have employed a system whereby each new magnet student receives a letter from one of our present students explaining that he or she would meet them the first day, take them around the school, be available at recess and lunch times and in general become their friend or buddy. Lasting friendships of both majority and minority students have evolved from this system. In addition, the student council comprised of minority and majority students in grades 4-8 is quite active. They plan and organize parties, dances and field trips. They also work to improve the school through suggestions for change, school clean up campaigns, etc.

5. **Has The Quality of Education Improved for Minority and Low Income Students in This School, and How Do You Account for This Success?**

First, the organizational plan in the major subjects has resulted directly in improvement in these areas. For example, five years ago the reading scores for our school were the lowest in the city. The

organizational plan was initiated before the arrival of the magnet schools so that the following statistics are significant for our minority and low income students. During this period the students have progressed from an average score in the first stanine to the third stanine two years ago to the fifth stanine last year. The testing program is limited to achievement tests in the third and sixth grade and to some Chapter I testing. However, the Worcester Public Schools testing program is expanding next year and will extend to testing at more grade levels. In addition, the number of students failing the minimum competency tests has been reduced dramatically. The less advanced students have also shown improvement in reading and writing.

These special programs have also generated more interest in the school and served as a source of motivation. Finally, the children integrated from 24 elementary schools have benefited both majority and minority children.

6. **If Another School in Your System Was Considering Becoming A Magnet School - What Advice Would You Give Them?**

The key to establishing a magnet school is good planning through workshops and visitations. The programs planned must be tailored to meet the specific needs and concerns of the students and parents. Each magnet school should be unique. Emphasis should be placed on programs with a specific appeal that will attract students and parents in addition to having a philosophy that reflects the ideas of the principal, staff, parents and students. A program is apt to be more successful if it is planned by the administration and staff who is going to implement it. It also should include active parent participation.

Requirements

1. Requirements under State Law

State law defines a school whose enrollment is more than 50% "non-white" as "racially imbalanced," and requires the school system operating such a school to implement various measures which will encourage and allow voluntary transfers of students which will have the effect of eliminating this condition.

Various incentives are provided to encourage and assist school districts in doing so, including transportation reimbursements, increased construction reimbursements, funding for magnet schools, and an "Equal Education Improvement Fund" to improve the quality of education in desegregated schools. These incentives, and the urban/suburban Metco Program, are offered under Chapter 636 of 1974.

A difficulty arises in the definition of "non-white." When the original Racial Imbalance Act was prepared, in 1965, there were few Hispanic students in the Commonwealth, and the drafters did not define how "non-white" should be applied. Early controversies arose over whether Cape Verdean and Chinese students should be counted as "non-white" along with Black students (decisions were reached that they should be), and there has been a continuing uncertainty about how to count Hispanic students. As is well known, there is a wide range of racial characteristics among Hispanic peoples, even though all are considered "minority" under Federal law.

On the advice of then-Attorney General Brooke, the responsibility has been placed upon local school officials to use their best judgment as to whether particular students should be considered "white" or "non-white" in making the racial census. I have also provided detailed guidelines on how and why to carry out the racial census.

2. Requirements under Federal law

The term "non-white" is not used by the Office for Civil Rights or by the desegregation cases which have been resolved in the federal court system.

A comprehensive category of "minority" is used, which includes Black, Hispanic, Native American (that is, Indian), and Asian-American Students.

Federal law does not create an obligation to reduce racial imbalance, as does state law. Instead, it forbids official action which results in the segregation or isolation of minority students. The story of desegregation cases since **Brown** in 1954 is largely one of defining the kinds of actions which would constitute such segregation, and the kinds of remedial measures which are necessary once a finding of illegal segregation has been made.

3. **Reconciling the Two in Massachusetts**

- A school system with schools more than 50% "non-white" must implement measures to encourage voluntary transfers which will improve racial balance.

- If the system is planning schools, or redistricting, or changing grade structures, or permitting school transfers, it must take racial balance into account in so doing.

- A school system with a disproportionate number of "minority" students in certain schools may take a variety of measures--including voluntary transfers, redistricting, or changing grade structures--to reduce this isolation.

- If the system is planning schools, or redistricting, or changing grade structures, or permitting student transfers, it must assure that these measures do not result in further segregation, whether intended or unintended but predictable.

- The Board of Education must take care not to approve measures (school construction, for example) which would result in further segregation.

- The Board may provide financial support and encouragement to school systems to reduce racial isolation on a voluntary basis, even when racial imbalance as such does not exist but is potential.

In practice, what this means is that we give particular attention to assuring that school systems do not take actions which would constitute official action resulting in segregation of minority students, and that they correct the effects of any past actions which they may have taken which had that result. We provide advice and assistance to protect the school system--and the Board--from desegregation litigation.

Over the past ten years every school system which we have approached with such concerns has taken appropriate steps without the need for state enforcement actions, though sometimes only after extended discussions and negotiations!

Massachusetts Among The States

In general, state government and state education agencies have been perceived--correctly--as reluctant and ineffective defenders of the constitutional rights of minority students, including the right not to be segregated. During the first round of school desegregation cases, the laws and policies of the seventeen states with laws requiring racially-separate schools were a primary basis for ordering remedial plans.

More recently, desegregation litigation in the North has generally involved the states as defendants, and Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana have been found guilty of contributing to unconstitutional racial segregation through policies and practices or through neglect of legal responsibilities. In response, and also as a result of the desire of the federal government to "get off the hook" of enforcing desegregation requirements, there has been considerable interest in the state role in desegregation and equal educational opportunity.

While thirty-nine states have passed some type of legislation or policy in support of equal opportunity and/or desegregation, only five states--Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania--have ever initiated enforcement actions to require that school systems eliminate racial isolation. We remain in close contact with our counterparts in these states.

Enforcement in Massachusetts was carried out from 1965 to 1974 on the basis of the Racial Imbalance Law, drafted by the Department of Education with the assistance of a Board-appointed study group. Under this statute racial balance plans were approved for Boston, Cambridge, Medford, and Springfield during the late 1960's; when implementation (mostly involving school construction) proved dilatory, the Board ordered development and implementation of "short-term" plans for Boston, New Bedford, and Springfield. In five rulings of the Supreme Judicial Court the Board's enforcement actions received strong encouragement.

The Racial Imbalance Law was drastically amended in 1974, substituting greatly increased funding for the power to order school redistricting. Since Boston and Springfield were already under court orders to implement the plans previously ordered by the Board, this seemed no great loss,

and the next several years were taken up with setting up programs of state financial support to desegregation which are unparalleled among the states.

Only three states--Massachusetts, New York, and Wisconsin--have appropriated state funds directly to support implementation of desegregation without being ordered to do so by a federal court.

The Massachusetts program of support for desegregation has several inter-locking elements, presented here in the order of their creation:

(1) Construction assistance has involved extra financial support for those construction/renovation projects which are undertaken as part of a racial balance plan; as noted, early plans generally called for building new schools with enlarged attendance areas which would draw racially-diverse enrollments. Schools have been built under this provision in Boston, Cambridge, New Bedford, and Springfield with a total cost of more than $600 million and state support of $370 million.

(2) Transportation reimbursement at 100% was originally established to support "Operation Exodus," a program organized by Black parents in Boston to transport their children to available space in predominantly-white schools; it has since proved of tremendous benefit to Boston and Springfield, in particular, as they have implemented their court-ordered plans.

(3) Urban/suburban transfers (commonly called "Metco" after the organization which pioneered and has continued to support the program) are supported by an annual appropriation; this pays for tuition, specialized support staff, and transportation costs for more than 3,100 minority students who attend suburban Boston and Springfield schools.

(4) The Equal Education Improvement Funds are set up for each system implementing a racial balance plan (currently Boston, Cambridge, New Bedford and Springfield), and each fund receives a share of the funds appropriated proportionate to the number of students reassigned. These funds may be used in any way to strengthen education, subject to the guidelines and priorities established by the Board.

(5) Magnet school funding supports additional costs of magnet schools, up to $300 per pupil, and also the costs of part-time magnet programs. These funds have

been the "cutting edge" of state desegregation efforts, since they have permitted such systems as Holyoke and Worcester to develop voluntary desegregation plans and to implement them with increased support for education. More than fifty magnet schools currently share these funds, and represent models of integrated urban education.

Over the past seven years state efforts in Massachusetts have taken a new direction, as we have worked with school systems to develop and implement voluntary plans, using the standards of the United States Constitution rather than the Massachusetts Racial Imbalance Law. Our goal has been to assure that the rights of every minority child not to be segregated and to receive equal educational opportunities were protected. Voluntary actions has prevented the desegregation litigation which was necessary in Boston because of the narrow scope of state racial balance efforts. We are particularly proud that it has not been necessary to initiate a single enforcement action since 1973.

Enrollment Trends and Patterns

by Charles Glenn and Judith Taylor

Districts with More than 35% Black and Hispanic Enrollment

There were six school systems in Massachusetts in October 1984 whose enrollment was at least 35% Black and Hispanic:

	Black	Hispanic	Combined
Boston	47.4	16.9	64.3
Springfield	28.4	25.5	53.9
Lawrence	3.2	47.1	50.3
Holyoke	4.2	40.8	45.
Chelsea	3.7	39.3	43.
Cambridge	28.3	10.2	38.5

Four of these systems have desegregation plans in place and fully implemented. Lawrence is in the initial stages of implementation of a plan which requires completion of two construction projects for full implementation. Desegregation of Chelsea, which has only four elementary schools, has not been a priority.

Boston, Springfield and Cambridge--systems which developed their original racial balance plans nearly twenty years ago--enroll two-thirds of the Black students in the Commonwealth. As the proportions for other systems suggest, the Black student population is not widely distributed, though more than 3,000 Black students from Boston and Springfield attend suburban schools under the Metco Program.

About 60% of the Hispanic students in the Commonwealth were in these six systems in October 1984.

	Black	Hispanic	Combined
six systems	37,795	28,858	62,653
state	56,563	41,609	98,172

Black Enrollment Trends

The Black enrollment statewide increased from 59,202 in 1974 (the year major desegregation began in Boston and Springfield) to 61,422 in 1978, then dropped to 57,405 in

1982 and 56,563 in 1984. The 1978-84 decline amounted to almost 8% of the 1978 Black enrollment.

This pattern was largely a function of changes in Boston and Springfield, the cities with the largest Black communities. Black enrollment in Boston dropped from 31,787 in 1978 to 28,994 in 1982, with a further (though slight) drop to 28,419 in 1984. Thus Black enrollment decline averaged 698 each year from 1978 to 1982, and 288 each year from 1982 to 1984. The six-year decline has amounted to almost 11% of the 1978 Black enrollment.

Black enrollment in Springfield dropped from 7,580 in 1978 to 6,718 in 1982, and again to 6,344 in 1984. The decline averaged 216 each year from 1978 to 1982, and 187 each year from 1982 to 1984. The six-year decline has amounted to more than 16% of Black enrollment in 1978.

Boston and Springfield together accounted for 95% of the decline in Black public school enrollment in Massachusetts from 1978 to 1983. Black enrollment increased in Brockton from 1,439 in 1978 to 1,833 in 1984, for a six-year increase of more than 27% of the 1978 Black enrollment. Worcester also experienced a Black enrollment increase, from 1,182 in 1978 to 1,267 in 1984, for a six-year increase of more than 7% of the 1978 Black enrollment. In both instances the numbers are too small to impact significantly upon the statewide pattern.

Hispanic Enrollment Trends

Hispanic enrollment statewide increased from 27,750 in 1974 to 31,508 in 1978 and 41,609 in 1984 for a 13,859 or 50% increase over the ten-year period. The increase averaged 940 each year from 1974 to 1978 and 1,684 each year from 1978 to 1984. It is safe to say, based upon the age profile of the Hispanic community as well as recent enrollments, that we will be educating substantially more Hispoanic students in five years than we are today, and that the movement into secondary schools (noted in our 1983 Annual Report) will continue.

Nine high schools were singled out in that repoort because their Hispanic enrollment had increased, in each case, by more than one hundred students between 1978 and 1982. As the figures below indicate, this trend is continuing in some cases, while desegregation efforts have had an effect in others since 1982. Other schools with high Hispanic enrollments which were not singled out in the last report have also been added to the list for priority concern:

	1978	1982	1984	
Lawrence High	396	732	756 (42%)	+360
Technical High (Spfd)	110	272	259 (31%)	+149
Jamaica Plain High	200	347	257 (30%)	+57
Chelsea High	164	347	354 (34%)	+190
Madison Park High	283	403	382 (20%)	+99
Holyoke High	233	352	390 (28%)	+157
Charlestown High	49	165	229 (19%)	+180
Lowell High	172	275	243 (9%)	+71
Dorchester High	35	136	156 (15%)	+121
BOSTON				
Brighton High			269 (23%)	
English High			288 (17%)	
Boston Latin School			147 (6%)	
South Boston High			169 (15%)	
Umana High			102 (10%)	
OTHER				
Brockton			241 (5%)	
Cambridge			227 (8%)	
Fitchburg			117 (11%)	
New Bedford			292 (9%)	
Salem			114 (8%)	
Commerce (Springfield)			338 (26%)	
Burncoat (Worcester)			143 (12%)	
North (Worcester)			189 (19%)	
South (Worcester)			138 (10%)	
TOTAL			5,800	

There are thus twenty-three high schools with at least one hundred Hispanic students each, and nearly six thousand students attend these schools; these students are at all stages in their mastery of English, as of the subject matter of secondary education, but it is safe to say that many of them require support beyond that usually supplied to other students. Although the data on dropout rates are unreliable, it is perfectly evident that a high proportion of these students do not complete high school. The proportion of them receiving first-rate vocational/technical training is small, as we have shown earlier in this report in the cases of Boston and Springfield.

A special case is represented by Boston Latin School, where at least 35% of the entering students must, by Court order, be Black or Hispanic. State monitoring reports on the Boston desegregation plan have expressed concern about the high proportion of students of these groups who do not

complete the highly demanding program, and about the inadequacy of the support available. Report #2 (February 1984) observed that 31% of white high school students, only 11% of Black high school students, and only 8% of Hispanic students not in bilingual classes were attending one of Boston's three examination high schools; by contrast, 57% of Asian students not in bilingual classes attended one of these schools.

It is encouraging to note that four vocational/technical schools offering effective programs have increased their Hispanic enrollment to one hundred or more:

Greater Lawrence	314 (18%)
Putnam (Springfield)	267 (19%)
Greater Lowell	137 (6.5%)
Keefe (Framingham)	105 (11%)
TOTAL	820

Keefe, in particular, pioneered in providing support for Hispanic students in vocational/technical education. Despite this progress, relatively few of the Hispanic secondary students in Massachusetts are in such programs. Many of the regional schools, for example, serve areas with few Hispanic students; in some cases, such as Northeast Met (serving Chelsea) and Dean Voc Tech (serving Holyoke) much remains to be done.

There is no reason to modify the conclusion reached in the 1983 Annual Report:

> This increase in Hispanic high school enrollment reflects both the changing age-profile of the Hispanic community in Massachusetts and--we trust--efforts to retain a larger percentage of Hispanic students in high schools. At the same time, it creates one of the major civil rights priorities for the Commonwealth, one which has been reflected in the Commissioner's operational plans for the past several years: how to provide effective educational programs for Hispanic secondary students, especially for those who are not in bilingual programs. Vocational opportunities, counselling, ongoing language support for Hispanic secondary students - these and related issues set a large part of the agenda for equal opportunity efforts in Massachusetts in 1980s.

But there is every reason to increase our efforts, as a Department-wide priority, to meet these needs.

Hispanic K-12 enrollment continues to increase in each of the school systems which has developed or is developing a desegregation plan, and in those cases below indicated with an (*), the primary object of desegregation has been to reduce the isolation of Hispanic students while at the same time strengthen the bilingual and other services provided them; this is an important objective in the other systems as well.

	1978	1984	Change	% Change
Boston	8,796	10,122	1,326	+15%
Brockton	620	899	279	+45%
Cambridge	702	804	102	+15%
* Holyoke	1,742	2,687	945	+54%
* Lawrence	2,421	4,117	1,696	+70%
Lowell	1,191	1,574	383	+32%
Lynn	502	871	369	+74%
New Bedford	843	1,093	250	+30%
Springfield	4,450	5,789	1,329	+30%
* Worcester	1,916	2,565	649	+34%

The Hispanic enrollment increase in Lawrence is striking, and justifies the priority which we are giving to support for implementation of the Lawrence desegregation plan.

As noted above, Chelsea also has a large and fast-growing Hispanic enrollment, though geographical and facility considerations have made it difficult to address desegregation. The system enrolled 849 Hispanic students in 1978 and 1,320 in 1984, for an increase of 480 (57%). We expect to work with the system over the next year to explore means of assuring that the rights of these students are protected.

Asian Enrollment Trends

As noted in the 1983 Annual Report, the fastest-growing group in public schools is Asian students, largely as a result of recent Southeast-Asian refugees. Asian enrollment increased from 5,937 in 1978 to 8,217 in 1978 and 15,901 in 1984 for an increase of 9,964 or 168% over the ten-year period. Average annual increase was 570 from 1974 to 1978 and 2,280 from 1978 to 1984. The 1982-1984 increase was 2,632.

There are no desegregation plans in Massachusetts which primarily address the isolation of Asian students, but those

systems indicated with an (*) below have made special efforts to address the educational needs of Asian students through the desegregation process:

	1978	1984	Change	% Change
* Boston	2,493	4,310	1,817	73%
Brookline	552	645	93	17%
Cambridge	186	389	203	109%
Chelsea	50	267	217	434%
Lawrence	29	212	183	631%
Lexington	195	319	124	64%
* Lowell	51	703	652	1,278%
Newton	343	457	114	33%
Quincy	103	375	272	264%
Springfield	63	172	109	173%
* Worcester	142	426	284	200%

Note that the sharpest growth has been in the cities. The established Asian communities in Brookline, Newton and Lexington grew less sharply.

Refugee Students

No exact data are available on students from refugee families, in part because it is difficult to reach agreement on which groups are "refugees." It is debated whether families from El Salvador, for example, should be considered refugees, and we have in any case no way to separate them out from the general "Hispanic" category. On the other hand, some students whose first language is Chinese are actually from Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos, and are considered refugees by the government and the resettlement agencies. Haitian immigrants may be either political refugees or "economic refugees," and it is in any case difficult to distinguish them clearly, in the statistics, from other francophone students including those of Canadian birth or ancestry.

The figures below represent all of the students reported as of October 1, 1984 whose first language was Khmer (Cambodian), Lao, Vietnamese, Hmong, Chinese, or either French or Creole. Only those instances of at least 20 students in a district of a particular language group are listed. At the bottom of the chart are the statewide totals for each group.

Note that this does not represent the students of "limited English-speaking ability, "though that may be true of most of these students. The figures shown here represent, essentially, the language spoken at home.

Concentrations of 20 or more students whose first language is as indicated

October 1984 AGE 3-21	KHMER	VIET	LAO/HMONG	CHINESE	FRENCH/ CREOLE
ATTLEBORO	58				
BOSTON	501	710	172	2262	1132
BROCKTON		44		66	
CAMBRIDGE				77	243
CHELSEA	131	78			
FALL RIVER				22	
FITCHBURG			52		
HAVERHILL		31			
LAWRENCE		107			
LOWELL	332	64	149		
LYNN	62		60		
MALDEN		41			
NEWTON		23	20	205	
QUINCY		36		178	
REVERE	210				
SOMERVILLE		47		29	60
SOUTHBRIDGE			36		
SPRINGFIELD		33	22		
WALTHAM				37	144
WORCESTER	32	212	20	40	
STATE	1638	1851	743	4179	2143

The following systems have especially large numbers of Khmer-speaking students:

	Number	Share of State Total
Boston	501	31%
Lowell	332	20%
Revere	218	13%
Chelsea	131	8%

Thus more than half are enrolled in Boston and Lowell, and nearly three-quarters in the four systems.

The following systems have especially large number of Lao-speaking students:

	Number	Share of State Total
Boston	166	24%
Lowell	149	22%
Lynn	60	9%

Lao-speaking students are somewhat less heavily concentrated.

The following systems have especially large numbers of Vietnamese-speaking students:

	Number	Share of State Total
Boston	710	38%
Worcester	212	11%
Lawrence	107	6%

Students identified explicitly as speaking Creole (a Haitian dialect of French, as distinguished from Criolo, a dialect of Cape Verdean Portuguese) are 240 in Boston, 77 in Cambridge, 39 in Somerville and 29 in Waltham. It is likely that many of the 1,707 other students whose first language is identified as "French" are Haitian as well. Boston, for example, is currently serving 670 Haitian students in bilingual programs.

Note, finally, that the numbers given above are low to a large extent, since new arrivals are pushing up the numbers in Lowell and other communities significantly during the course of the school year.

Racial Isolation in Schools

One of the first enrollment reports prepared by EEO, using October 1, 1970 data, presented the distribution of "non-white" and white students in schools with various racial compositions. The category "non-white," though enshrined in our law, is little used today, and it is difficult to make an exact comparison of enrollment statistics before and after 1974, when we adopted the present racial categories. In general, it refers to Black, Asian and Native American (Indian) students, and those Hispanic students who are reported as "non-white" by local school officials. This confuses the statistics less than one might expect, since there were few Hispanic or Asian students in Massachusetts in 1970.

- In 1970, 14,148 or 23% of the non-white public school students in the Commonwealth attended schools which were at least 90% non-white; there were no such schools in 1983.

- 18,136 or 30% of non-white students attended schools which were at least 80% non-white; 2,764 or 3% of non-white students attended such schools in 1983. Despite an

enrollment increase statewide from 59,999 to 81,727 (21,728 or 36%), the number of non-white students attending schools in which they were in the great majority decreased by 15,372 or 85%.

- The number of schools with at least 80% non-white enrollment dropped from 42 in 1970 to 3 in 1983.

- A school is defined, by the Racial Imbalance Law, as "racially balanced" if its enrollment is at least 50% white. By that standard, the number of non-white students attending "balanced" schools increased from 32,367 in 1970 to 50,041 in 1983, an increase of 17,674 or 55%. The increase in non-white students attending "balanced" schools was thus significantly greater than was their overall increase.

- This is particularly significant in view of the fact that the goal of desegregation in Boston--where nearly half of the non-white students attend--is no longer to achieve "racial balance" but to achieve enrollments which reflect those of the city or one of its sections. This explains the large increase (from 3,255 to 13,907) in non-white students attending schools between 60% and 70% non-white. By current standards, most of these are desegregated schools. Nevertheless, the proportion of all non-white students who attend "balanced" schools increased from 54% to 58%.

- Current desegregation efforts concentrate on the category "minority" rather than the category "non-white," for reasons explained in the section of this report on "Massachusetts and Federal Requirements." Using this standard, which include all Hispanic students as "minority," it is significant that the proportion of all white students in the Commonwealth attending public schools with fewer than 10% minority enrollment dropped from more than 95% in 1970 to 87% in 1978 and to 81% in 1983. Thus white students were more likely to be in a classroom with one or more minority students.

- Because of the special interest in assessing Boston desegregation, we reprint a few comments from the 1983 Annual Report:

"The present Director of EEO was appointed midway in the 1970-71 school year. That year Boston operated 191 schools, of which 32 were more than 90% "non-white" (corresponding, essentially, to Black) and 82 were more than 90% white. Fourteen schools enrolled no minority students at all. Only 13 of the 191 schools, or 7%, were in the range between 50% and 70% white defined as "racial

balance" under Massachusetts law. In other words, the Boston Public Schools were highly segregated in 1970-71.

"Overall enrollment in 1970 was 32.5% "non-white," up from 16.4% in 1960. If racial proportions had continued to change at the 1960-1970 rate, the 1983 enrollment would be 54% "non-white." Black enrollment is in fact 48% of the total in 1983-84.

"In summary, of 191 schools operated by the Boston School Committee in 1970, 87 have closed (not counting old facilities, like the Agassiz, Quincy, and English High, which were replaced with new facilities with the same school identity). Twelve remain over 60% white, including Boston Latin School and nine schools in East Boston. Ninety-two became or remained racially mixed, in most cases coming to reflect citywide racial proportions more closely. Eighteen new schools have opened; they range from 8% to 46% white.

"Another way to state the degree of desegregation achieved is to compare the number of schools which were within twenty percentage points of the citywide white enrollment (68%) in 1970 with the number within that range of the 1983 white enrollment (28%). Forty-three of 191 schools, or 23%, were between 48% and 88% white in 1970-71, and 107 of 123 schools, or 87%, are between 8% and 48% white in 1983-84."

- On February 26, 1985, the Board of Education took note of "disproportionate concentration of minority students in certain schools" where the minority proportion was at least twenty percentage points higher than that in their systems. Thus, for example, the Bentley School in Salem was 32% minority while the total Salem enrollment was only 12% minority. The Board noted these as situations for which technical assistance and funding would be available, upon request from the school system, to develop means of correcting the disproportion on a voluntary basis. The schools identified included two in Brockton, two in Chelsea, one in Framingham, two in Holyoke, one in Lowell, two in Lynn, one in New Bedford, one in Salem, five in Springfield and two in Worcester.

Enrollment Data By Race

This section contains school enrollment tables for Boston, Brockton, Cambridge, Chelsea, Fall River, Fitchburg, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, Mashpee, Medford, New Bedford, Revere, Salem, Springfield, Waltham and Worcester. The table for each school system shows enrollments by race for every school in the system. The data are taken from the Individual School Report, October 1, 1984.

There are two sets of numbers for each school. An example is the Longfellow School in Cambridge:

	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
# Students	56	142	29	0	232	459
% of Total	12	30	6	0	50	

The first line "# Students" shows the actual number of students enrolled from each racial group at the Longfellow: 56 Black students, 142 Hispanic, 29 Asian, 0 American Indian and 232 White students, for a total of 459 students. The second line "% of Total" gives the percentage that each racial group composes of the total enrollment of the school. Thus, Black students form 12% of the student body, Hispanic students 30%, Asian students 6%, and White students 50% of the student body.

District totals are given at the end of the table. Again, the first line shows the actual number of students from each racial group enrolled in the district and the second line shows the proportional (percentage) enrollment of each group in the district.

The school systems included in this section represent the Commonwealth's desegregating districts as well as systems that were identified to have one or more schools enrolling a disproportionate number of minority students. These districts account for 77% of Massachusetts' Black students, 80% of the Hispanic students, 49% of the Asian students, 61% of the American Indian students and 18% of the White students. The statewide totals for each racial/ethnic group are: 55,363 (Black); 41,609 (Hispanic); 15,900 (Asian); 1066 (American Indian); and 747,302 (White).

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1,1984 Data Census

BOSTON

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
AGASSIZ						
# Students	209	373	8	2	120	712
% of total	29	52	1	0	16	
A HAMILTON						
# Students	61	15	191	3	41	311
% of total	19	4	61	0	13	
JACKSON MANN						
# Students	284	18	273	0	127	702
% of total	40	2	38	0	18	
BEETHOVEN						
# Students	89	6	4	0	86	185
% of total	48	3	2	0	46	
CARTER DEVLP DAY CARE						
# Students	10	10	0	0	7	27
% of total	37	37	0	0	25	
TILESTON						
# Students	1	1	0	0	0	2
% of total	50	50	0	0	0	
CHARLES E MACKEY						
# Students	233	116	2	0	109	460
% of total	50	25	0	0	23	
C SUMNER						
# Students	239	26	3	0	194	462
% of total	51	5	0	0	41	
C TAYLOR						
# Students	415	9	5	3	71	503
% of total	82	1	0	0	14	
C GUILD						
# Students	154	20	5	4	56	239
% of total	64	8	2	1	23	
D ALIGHIERI						
# Students	8	15	25	2	120	170
% of total	4	8	14	1	70	
D ELLIS						
# Students	250	164	3	0	62	479
% of total	52	34	0	0	12	
DEARBORN						
# Students	239	48	1	4	102	394
% of total	60	12	0	1	25	
DENNIS C HALEY						
# Students	170	52	12	7	71	312
% of total	54	16	3	2	22	
D MCKAY						
# Students	236	59	24	0	96	415
% of total	56	14	5	0	23	
E EVERETT						
# Students	152	26	1	2	89	251
% of total	58	9	0	0	30	
E GREENWOOD						
# Students	279	24	3	0	148	454
% of total	61	5	0	0	32	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

BOSTON

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
ELIOT						
# Students	94	62	16	0	52	224
% of total	41	27	7	0	23	
E MENDELL						
# Students	85	104	0	0	41	230
% of total	36	45	0	0	17	
E FIFIELD						
# Students	327	31	4	4	72	438
% of total	74	7	0	0	16	
FARRAGUT						
# Students	106	62	43	2	48	261
% of total	40	23	16	0	18	
F PARKMAN						
# Students	100	34	14	1	42	199
% of total	54	17	7	0	21	
FRANK V THOMPSON MIDDLE						
# Students	316	13	0	2	62	393
% of total	80	3	0	0	15	
F ROOSEVELT						
# Students	97	3	3	0	103	206
% of total	47	1	1	0	50	
G CONLEY						
# Students	103	5	0	0	71	179
% of total	57	2	0	0	39	
H BALDWIN						
# Students	72	49	151	2	25	299
% of total	24	16	50	0	8	
H GREW						
# Students	111	4	1	1	104	221
% of total	50	1	0	0	47	
H HIGGINSON						
# Students	90	43	7	3	37	180
% of total	50	23	3	1	20	
PHYLLIS WHEATLEY MIDDLE						
# Students	185	51	21	6	70	333
% of total	55	15	6	1	21	
H ODONNELL						
# Students	3	16	19	2	221	261
% of total	1	6	7	0	84	
J CONDON						
# Students	256	146	5	3	364	784
% of total	33	18	0	0	46	
J GARFIELD						
# Students	68	32	21	0	93	209
% of total	32	24	10	0	32	
J HENNIGAN						
# Students	272	276	24	3	135	710
% of total	38	38	3	0	19	
J CHITTICK						
# Students	335	12	2	2	46	397
% of total	84	3	0	0	11	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

BOSTON

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
JAMES OTIS						
# Students	18	64	3	1	261	347
% of total	5	18	0	0	75	
JOHN CHEVERUS MIDDLE						
# Students	1	5	4	0	158	168
% of total	0	2	2	0	94	
J KENNEDY						
# Students	133	254	3	0	42	432
% of total	30	58	0	0	9	
J HOLLAND						
# Students	555	218	1	6	89	869
% of total	63	25	0	0	10	
J PHILBRICK						
# Students	55	9	0	1	61	126
% of total	43	7	0	0	48	
J MARSHALL						
# Students	517	214	10	6	85	832
% of total	62	25	1	0	10	
JOHN W MCCORMACK						
# Students	143	180	4	11	227	565
% of total	25	31	0	1	40	
J WINTHROP						
# Students	107	45	2	3	69	226
% of total	47	19	0	1	30	
J TYNAN						
# Students	177	8	0	3	129	317
% of total	55	2	0	0	40	
J HURLEY						
# Students	153	129	3	1	47	333
% of total	45	38	0	0	14	
J LEE						
# Students	319	62	0	4	87	472
% of total	67	13	0	0	18	
J MANNING						
# Students	78	27	0	0	68	173
% of total	45	15	0	0	39	
J KILMER						
# Students	112	6	3	0	119	240
% of total	46	2	1	0	49	
HARVARD-KENT						
# Students	152	18	166	1	114	451
% of total	33	3	36	0	25	
H LONGFELLOW						
# Students	109	50	4	1	80	244
% of total	44	20	1	0	32	
L STONE						
# Students	169	17	4	2	26	218
% of total	77	7	1	0	11	
M BRADLEY						
# Students	8	10	12	2	198	230
% of total	3	4	5	0	86	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

BOSTON

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
M FULLER						
# Students	103	100	0	1	41	245
% of total	42	40	0	0	16	
MATTAHUNT						
# Students	400	104	6	0	225	736
% of total	54	14	0	0	30	
MATHER						
# Students	359	50	7	4	119	539
% of total	66	9	1	0	22	
M TOBIN						
# Students	177	239	40	5	68	529
% of total	33	45	7	0	12	
PERKINS						
# Students	65	31	1	4	139	240
% of total	27	12	0	1	57	
MOZART						
# Students	110	7	2	0	46	165
% of total	66	4	1	0	27	
R MURPHY						
# Students	500	27	3	1	195	725
% of total	68	3	0	0	26	
N HALE						
# Students	130	36	2	1	39	208
% of total	62	17	0	0	18	
O PERRY						
# Students	36	16	0	0	82	134
% of total	25	11	0	0	61	
OHRENBERGER						
# Students	260	41	92	3	103	499
% of total	52	8	18	0	20	
P LYNDON						
# Students	45	4	0	0	137	186
% of total	24	2	0	0	73	
P KENNEDY						
# Students	2	10	9	3	188	212
% of total	0	4	4	1	88	
P CHEARN						
# Students	95	9	2	1	114	221
% of total	42	4	0	0	51	
P DEVER						
# Students	168	192	9	2	162	533
% of total	31	36	1	0	30	
P A SHAW						
# Students	243	7	1	1	43	295
% of total	82	2	0	0	14	
P BATES						
# Students	89	25	1	4	86	205
% of total	43	12	0	1	41	
Q DICKERMAN						
# Students	259	50	0	3	34	346
% of total	74	14	0	0	9	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

BOSTON

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
QUINCY						
# Students	250	30	347	1	101	729
% of total	34	4	47	0	13	
R EMERSON						
# Students	129	63	1	8	25	225
% of total	57	27	0	3	11	
R CLAP						
# Students	50	21	7	2	99	179
% of total	27	11	3	1	55	
S ADAMS						
# Students	22	14	7	0	204	247
% of total	8	5	2	0	82	
S MASON						
# Students	52	28	0	1	38	119
% of total	43	23	0	0	31	
S GREENWOOD						
# Students	265	142	2	1	69	479
% of total	55	29	0	0	14	
T ROOSEVELT MIDDLE						
# Students	130	74	4	0	35	243
% of total	53	30	1	0	14	
T GARDNER						
# Students	84	160	68	1	106	419
% of total	20	38	16	0	25	
T KENNY						
# Students	99	7	2	5	131	244
% of total	40	2	0	2	53	
W PRESCOTT						
# Students	129	17	167	0	167	480
% of total	26	3	34	0	34	
W CHANNING						
# Students	132	12	4	2	102	252
% of total	52	4	1	0	40	
W ENDICOTT						
# Students	145	9	0	0	27	181
% of total	80	4	0	0	14	
W MCKINLEY						
# Students	171	32	2	1	107	313
% of total	54	10	0	0	34	
W RUSSELL						
# Students	185	147	3	4	96	355
% of total	29	41	0	1	27	
W TROTTER						
# Students	366	128	20	15	159	688
% of total	53	18	2	2	23	
WINSHIP						
# Students	60	160	31	3	80	334
% of total	17	47	9	0	23	
HEMENWAY						
# Students	47	0	0	0	65	112
% of total	41	0	0	0	58	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

BOSTON

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
J CURLEY						
# Students	167	78	3	0	76	324
% of total	51	24	0	0	23	
BLACKSTONE						
# Students	331	440	29	4	82	886
% of total	37	49	3	0	9	
JOSEPH J BARNES MIDDLE						
# Students	15	56	18	5	476	570
% of total	2	9	3	0	83	
MARTIN LUTHER KING JR MID						
# Students	293	117	17	4	122	553
% of total	52	21	3	0	22	
GROVER CLEVELAND						
# Students	617	231	8	5	110	971
% of total	63	23	0	0	11	
MARY E CURLEY MIDDLE						
# Students	275	351	6	4	94	730
% of total	37	48	0	0	12	
THOMAS A EDISON JR HIGH						
# Students	139	147	151	1	105	543
% of total	25	27	27	0	19	
CLARENCE R EDWARDS MIDDLE						
# Students	154	98	188	1	75	516
% of total	29	18	36	0	14	
PATRICK F GAVIN MIDDLE						
# Students	212	74	2	4	202	494
% of total	42	14	0	0	40	
OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES JR						
# Students	287	20	3	5	68	383
% of total	74	5	0	1	17	
WASHINGTON IRVING MIDDLE						
# Students	385	31	106	1	190	633
% of total	48	4	16	0	30	
SOLOMON LEWENBERG MIDDLE						
# Students	277	10	1	4	76	368
% of total	75	2	0	1	20	
LEWIS MIDDLE SCHOOL						
# Students	108	44	2	4	44	202
% of total	53	21	0	1	21	
MICHELANGELO MIDDLE						
# Students	116	56	68	0	28	268
% of total	43	20	25	0	10	
WM B ROGERS MIDDLE						
# Students	397	14	4	3	151	569
% of total	69	2	0	0	26	
ROBERT GOULD SHAW MIDDLE						
# Students	184	17	3	0	68	272
% of total	67	6	1	0	25	
WILLIAM H TAFT MIDDLE						
# Students	167	166	101	3	117	554
% of total	30	29	18	0	21	

123

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

BOSTON

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
JAMES P TIMILTY MIDDLE						
# Students	205	140	27	1	51	424
% of total	48	33	6	0	12	
WOODROW WILSON MIDDLE						
# Students	532	37	2	4	92	667
% of total	79	5	0	0	13	
BRIGHTON HIGH						
# Students	423	269	244	4	207	1147
% of total	36	23	21	0	18	
CHARLESTOWN HIGH						
# Students	489	229	280	2	200	1200
% of total	40	19	23	0	16	
DORCHESTER HIGH						
# Students	677	156	6	0	157	996
% of total	67	15	0	0	15	
JEREMIAH E BURKE HIGH						
# Students	532	73	7	2	86	700
% of total	76	10	1	0	12	
EAST BOSTON HIGH						
# Students	216	53	33	5	776	1083
% of total	19	4	3	0	71	
THE ENGLISH HIGH						
# Students	946	288	62	7	349	1652
% of total	57	17	3	0	21	
MADISON PARK HIGH						
# Students	1099	382	15	7	387	1890
% of total	58	20	0	0	20	
BOSTON LATIN ACADEMY						
# Students	496	57	142	5	676	1376
% of total	36	4	10	0	49	
HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL						
# Students	752	29	6	4	189	980
% of total	76	2	0	0	19	
JAMAICA PLAIN HIGH						
# Students	413	257	7	7	169	853
% of total	48	30	0	0	19	
BOSTON LATIN						
# Students	560	147	315	2	1363	2387
% of total	23	6	13	0	57	
SOUTH BOSTON HIGH						
# Students	430	169	140	12	337	1088
% of total	39	15	12	1	30	
WEST ROXBURY SCH						
# Students	860	67	11	3	484	1425
% of total	60	4	0	0	33	
BOSTON TECH HIGH						
# Students	550	86	213	5	262	1116
% of total	49	7	19	0	23	
MARIO UMANA HARBOR						
# Students	579	102	91	1	245	1018
% of total	56	10	8	0	24	

130 BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

BOSTON

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
BOSTON HIGH SCHOOL						
# Students	476	144	15	5	181	821
% of total	57	17	1	0	22	
COPLEY SQ HIGH						
# Students	290	66	28	5	122	511
% of total	56	12	5	0	23	
R HERNANDEZ						
# Students	48	119	0	0	27	194
% of total	24	61	0	0	13	
JACKSON MANN						
# Students	52	49	6	0	42	149
% of total	34	32	4	0	28	
District Totals						
# of Students	28419	10122	4310	386	16830	59987
% of Total	47	16	7	0	28	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1,1984 Data Census

BROCKTON

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
ARNONE COMM SCH						
# Students	87	177	33	8	433	738
% of total	11	23	4	1	58	
ASHFIELD						
# Students	78	43	8	4	487	620
% of total	12	6	1	0	78	
BROOKFIELD						
# Students	120	41	16	1	863	1041
% of total	11	3	1	0	82	
KENNEDY						
# Students	3	0	8	24	609	644
% of total	0	0	1	3	94	
DAVIS,						
# Students	120	37	9	0	794	960
% of total	12	3	0	0	82	
FRANKLIN						
# Students	13	8	6	0	327	354
% of total	3	2	1	0	92	
GILMORE						
# Students	152	11	4	4	348	519
% of total	29	2	0	0	67	
HANCOCK						
# Students	51	15	17	3	756	842
% of total	6	1	2	0	89	
HUNTINGTON						
# Students	67	30	7	2	470	576
% of total	11	5	1	0	81	
RAYMOND						
# Students	110	58	8	1	603	780
% of total	14	7	1	0	77	
PAINE						
# Students	85	26	27	0	156	294
% of total	28	8	9	0	53	
WHITMAN						
# Students	7	11	5	1	264	288
% of total	2	3	1	0	91	
WINTHROP						
# Students	18	19	4	1	245	287
% of total	6	6	1	0	85	
DOWNEY						
# Students	83	43	7	4	506	643
% of total	12	6	1	0	78	
EAST JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	94	40	3	1	504	642
% of total	14	6	0	0	78	
NORTH JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	110	45	7	0	540	702
% of total	15	6	0	0	76	
SOUTH JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	65	34	7	0	626	732
% of total	8	4	0	0	85	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

BROCKTON

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
WEST JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	42	19	22	4	668	755
% of total	5	2	2	0	88	
SUPPLEMENTARY SERV CTR						
# Students	0	0	0	0	10	10
% of total	0	0	0	0	100	
HOME CLASS						
# Students	1	0	0	0	4	5
% of total	20	0	0	0	80	
BROCKTON HIGH						
# Students	524	241	76	3	3849	4693
% of total	11	5	1	0	82	
ITHAKA ALTERNATIVE HS						
# Students	3	1	0	1	34	39
% of total	7	2	0	2	87	
District Totals						
# of Students	1833	899	274	62	13096	16164
% of Total	11	5	1	0	81	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

CAMBRIDGE

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
AGASSIZ						
# Students	68	11	26	0	154	259
% of total	26	4	10	0	59	
M E FITZGERALD						
# Students	111	44	55	1	234	445
% of total	24	9	12	0	52	
FLETCHER						
# Students	84	72	7	0	219	382
% of total	21	18	1	0	57	
HAGGERTY						
# Students	27	2	18	0	67	114
% of total	23	1	15	0	58	
CHARLES G HARRINGTON						
# Students	139	67	15	1	464	686
% of total	20	9	2	0	67	
KING						
# Students	201	22	14	3	281	521
% of total	38	4	2	0	53	
LONGFELLOW						
# Students	56	142	29	0	232	459
% of total	12	30	6	0	50	
MORSE						
# Students	102	28	26	0	186	342
% of total	29	8	7	0	54	
PEABODY						
# Students	114	32	51	0	214	411
% of total	27	7	12	0	52	
ROBERT F KENNEDY						
# Students	66	37	4	0	197	304
% of total	21	12	1	0	64	
ROBERTS						
# Students	82	49	10	0	169	310
% of total	26	15	3	0	54	
JOHN M TOBIN						
# Students	197	51	37	0	328	613
% of total	32	8	6	0	53	
GRAHAM/PARKS NEW ALTERN						
# Students	131	20	7	1	170	349
% of total	43	5	2	0	48	
CAMB RINDGE + LATIN						
# Students	837	227	90	3	1536	2693
% of total	31	8	3	0	57	
District Totals						
# of Students	2235	804	389	9	4451	7888
% of Total	28	10	4	0	56	

BEST COPY

1984 Ra al Enrollments — from October 1,1984 Data Census

CHELSEA

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
BURKE						
# Students	3	30	3	2	182	220
% of total	1	13	1	0	82	
PRATTVILLE						
# Students	5	21	5	0	191	222
% of total	2	9	2	0	86	
SHURTLEFF ELEM						
# Students	43	464	105	0	288	900
% of total	4	51	11	0	32	
WILLIAMS ELEM						
# Students	20	251	23	0	182	476
% of total	4	52	4	0	38	
WILLIAMS JR HIGH						
# Students	30	209	48	0	260	547
% of total	5	38	8	0	47	
CHELSEA HIGH						
# Students	25	354	83	1	551	1014
% of total	2	34	8	0	54	
District Totals						
# of Students	126	1329	267	3	1654	3379
% of Total	3	39	7	0	48	

135 BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

FALL RIVER

School	Black	Hisoanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
BELISLE						
# Students	3	0	2	0	183	188
% of total	1	0	1	0	97	
BRAYTON AVENUE						
# Students	2	2	0	0	184	188
% of total	1	1	0	0	97	
CARROLL						
# Students	2	3	2	0	323	329
% of total	0	0	0	0	98	
CONNELL						
# Students	5	2	2	0	150	159
% of total	3	1	1	0	94	
COUGHLIN						
# Students	1	1	0	0	165	167
% of total	0	0	0	0	98	
DAVOL						
# Students	4	1	1	0	182	188
% of total	2	0	0	0	96	
DORAN						
# Students	1	0	0	0	270	271
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
DORAN ANNEX						
# Students	1	0	0	0	185	186
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
DUBUQUE						
# Students	3	9	0	0	191	203
% of total	1	4	0	0	94	
FOWLER						
# Students	0	0	0	0	139	139
% of total	0	0	0	0	100	
GREENE						
# Students	1	0	0	0	190	191
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
SILVIA						
# Students	4	1	12	0	283	300
% of total	1	0	4	0	94	
HEALY						
# Students	6	0	1	0	229	236
% of total	2	0	0	0	97	
HIGHLAND						
# Students	0	0	0	0	164	164
% of total	0	0	0	0	100	
LAUREL LAKE						
# Students	8	0	0	0	263	271
% of total	2	0	0	0	97	
LETOURNEAU						
# Students	1	0	0	0	226	227
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
LINCOLN						
# Students	1	0	8	0	263	272
% of total	0	0	2	0	96	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

FALL RIVER

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
OSBORN STREET						
# Students	2	4	3	0	168	177
% of total	1	2	1	0	94	
SLADE						
# Students	1	0	2	0	304	307
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
SMALL						
# Students	1	3	3	0	340	347
% of total	0	0	0	0	97	
SPENCER BORDEN						
# Students	3	0	0	0	157	160
% of total	1	0	0	0	98	
TANSEY						
# Students	1	0	0	0	165	166
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
WATSON						
# Students	10	0	0	0	256	266
% of total	3	0	0	0	96	
WESTALL						
# Students	9	4	2	1	318	334
% of total	2	1	0	0	95	
WILEY						
# Students	5	0	0	0	175	180
% of total	2	0	0	0	97	
WIXON						
# Students	3	0	0	0	316	319
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
EDMOND P. TALBOT MIDDLE						
# Students	6	128	8	0	563	705
% of total	0	18	1	0	79	
HENRY LORD MIDDLE						
# Students	11	0	0	0	642	653
% of total	1	0	0	0	98	
MORTON MIDDLE						
# Students	12	2	1	0	715	730
% of total	1	0	0	0	97	
MATTHEW J KUSS MIDDLE						
# Students	13	2	4	0	813	832
% of total	1	0	0	0	97	
B M C DURFEE HIGH						
# Students	28	44	16	2	3023	3185
% of total	0	1	0	0	97	
District Totals						
# of Students	139	206	67	3	11545	11960
% of Total	1	1	0	0	96	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1,1984 Data Census

FITCHBURG

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
CROCKER						
# Students	26	133	37	0	470	666
% of total	3	19	5	0	70	
HOSMER						
# Students	9	26	5	0	235	275
% of total	3	9	1	0	85	
REINGOLD						
# Students	38	68	6	0	711	823
% of total	4	8	0	0	86	
SOUTH FITCHBURG						
# Students	13	27	3	0	115	158
% of total	8	17	1	0	72	
B F BROWN JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	45	88	26	1	416	576
% of total	7	15	4	0	72	
MEMORIAL MIDDLE						
# Students	6	26	2	0	545	579
% of total	1	4	0	0	94	
MCKAY CAMPUS-FSC						
# Students	49	73	6	0	224	352
% of total	13	20	1	0	63	
FITCHBURG HIGH						
# Students	44	117	27	0	867	1055
% of total	4	11	2	0	82	
District Totals						
# of Students	230	558	112	1	3583	4484
% of Total	5	12	2	0	79	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

HOLYOKE

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
HIGHLAND						
# Students	24	250	6	0	186	468
% of total	5	53	1	0	40	
KIRTLAND						
# Students	15	107	0	0	151	273
% of total	5	39	0	0	55	
MCMAHON						
# Students	22	121	1	0	271	415
% of total	5	29	0	0	65	
METCALF						
# Students	3	206	1	0	100	312
% of total	0	66	0	0	32	
MORGAN						
# Students	13	172	0	0	91	276
% of total	4	62	0	0	32	
KELLY						
# Students	19	302	7	0	208	536
% of total	3	56	1	0	38	
WHITE						
# Students	9	21	2	0	119	151
% of total	5	13	1	0	78	
SULLIVAN						
# Students	11	110	3	1	191	316
% of total	3	34	0	0	60	
DONAHUE						
# Students	21	70	1	0	96	188
% of total	11	37	0	0	51	
PECK						
# Students	41	488	7	2	571	1029
% of total	3	39	0	0	55	
LAWRENCE ELEM						
# Students	14	306	2	0	203	527
% of total	2	58	0	0	38	
JOHN J LYNCH JR HIGH						
# Students	22	178	2	1	268	471
% of total	4	37	0	0	56	
HOLYOKE HIGH						
# Students	56	390	8	1	926	1381
% of total	4	28	0	0	67	
WM J DEAN VOC. TECH. HIGH						
# Students	6	42	0	0	187	235
% of total	2	17	0	0	79	
District Totals						
# of Students	275	2687	40	5	3570	6578
% of Total	4	40	0	0	54	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

LAWRENCE

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
ARLINGTON						
# Students	4	207	10	0	68	289
% of total	1	71	3	0	23	
BREEN						
# Students	15	210	38	0	275	538
% of total	2	39	7	0	51	
BRUCE						
# Students	58	463	6	5	570	1102
% of total	5	42	0	0	51	
HENNESSEY						
# Students	25	331	7	0	150	513
% of total	4	64	1	0	29	
J P KANE SOUTH JR HIGH						
# Students	10	97	23	0	426	556
% of total	1	17	4	0	76	
LAWLOR						
# Students	13	92	0	0	90	195
% of total	6	47	0	0	46	
LEAHY						
# Students	24	418	6	1	221	670
% of total	3	62	0	0	32	
JAMES F LEONARD						
# Students	6	375	2	0	274	657
% of total	0	57	0	0	41	
OLIVER JR HIGH						
# Students	18	521	13	0	225	777
% of total	2	67	1	0	28	
ROLLINS						
# Students	4	113	12	2	292	423
% of total	0	26	2	0	69	
SALEM STREET						
# Students	8	61	23	0	100	192
% of total	4	31	11	0	52	
SAUNDERS						
# Students	12	45	0	0	200	257
% of total	4	17	0	0	77	
TARBOX						
# Students	9	331	10	0	97	447
% of total	2	74	2	0	21	
WETHERBEE						
# Students	11	97	6	0	239	353
% of total	3	27	1	0	67	
LAWRENCE HIGH						
# Students	59	756	56	2	896	1769
% of total	3	42	3	0	50	
District Totals						
# of Students	276	4117	212	10	4123	8738
% of Total	3	47	2	0	47	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1,1984 Data Census

LOWELL

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
OCONNELL						
# Students	3	35	0	0	168	207
% of total	1	17	0	0	81	
COLBURN						
# Students	0	22	6	0	135	163
% of total	0	13	3	0	82	
ROGERSGERS						
# Students	19	100	48	0	422	589
% of total	3	16	8	0	71	
GREEN						
# Students	8	78	11	0	95	192
% of total	4	40	5	0	49	
GREENHALGE						
# Students	5	21	115	0	386	527
% of total	0	3	21	0	73	
PYNE						
# Students	0	0	1	0	265	266
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
LEE						
# Students	1	10	2	0	53	66
% of total	1	15	3	0	80	
LINCOLN						
# Students	14	52	12	2	170	250
% of total	5	20	4	0	68	
MOLLOY						
# Students	6	41	52	1	258	358
% of total	1	11	14	0	72	
MOREY						
# Students	15	16	65	0	605	701
% of total	2	2	9	0	86	
LEBLANC						
# Students	4	21	2	0	232	259
% of total	1	8	0	0	89	
PAWTUCKETVILLE MEM						
# Students	9	143	4	0	264	420
% of total	2	34	0	0	62	
PINE STREET						
# Students	0	0	2	0	151	153
% of total	0	0	1	0	98	
REILLY						
# Students	14	39	13	0	528	594
% of total	2	6	2	0	88	
HENRY L ROBINSON						
# Students	13	73	6	0	545	637
% of total	2	11	0	0	85	
SHAUGHNESSY						
# Students	22	52	4	0	207	285
% of total	7	18	1	0	72	
VARNUM						
# Students	6	88	3	0	322	419
% of total	1	21	0	0	76	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

LOWELL

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
WASHINGTON						
# Students	6	119	3	0	240	368
% of total	1	32	0	0	65	
ARTS SCHOOL						
# Students	11	28	3	2	91	135
% of total	8	20	2	1	67	
CITY SCHOOL						
# Students	11	67	0	0	122	200
% of total	5	33	0	0	61	
AMES						
# Students	0	6	1	0	92	99
% of total	0	6	1	0	92	
ELIOT						
# Students	0	6	0	0	27	33
% of total	0	18	0	0	81	
BARTLETT JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	30	161	70	0	428	689
% of total	4	23	10	0	62	
BUTLER JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	12	60	4	0	152	228
% of total	5	26	1	0	66	
JAMES S DALEY JR HIGH						
# Students	18	62	84	0	754	918
% of total	1	6	9	0	82	
MOODY JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	1	24	3	0	305	333
% of total	0	7	0	0	91	
JOSEPH A MCAVINNUE						
# Students	5	6	10	1	473	495
% of total	1	1	2	0	95	
LOWELL HIGH						
# Students	73	243	179	4	2180	2679
% of total	2	9	6	0	81	
District Totals						
# of Students	386	1574	783	10	9670	12263
% of Total	2	12	5	0	78	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

LYNN

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
ABORN						
# Students	1	4	4	0	260	269
% of total	0	1	1	0	96	
DREWICZ ELEM						
# Students	17	17	8	0	364	406
% of total	4	4	1	0	89	
BRICKETT						
# Students	21	6	3	0	333	363
% of total	5	1	0	0	91	
CALLAHAN						
# Students	49	36	9	0	306	400
% of total	12	9	2	0	76	
COBBET						
# Students	57	42	8	0	305	412
% of total	13	10	1	0	74	
COMMUNITY DAY						
# Students	5	0	0	0	31	36
% of total	13	0	0	0	86	
CONNERY						
# Students	60	34	11	0	193	298
% of total	20	11	3	0	64	
HARRINGTON						
# Students	64	120	8	0	193	385
% of total	16	31	2	0	50	
HIGHLAND						
# Students	38	23	0	0	390	451
% of total	8	5	0	0	86	
HOOD						
# Students	22	26	5	0	425	478
% of total	4	5	1	0	88	
INGALLS						
# Students	82	96	10	2	317	507
% of total	16	18	1	0	62	
LINCOLN						
# Students	10	14	0	0	164	188
% of total	5	7	0	0	87	
LYNN WOODS						
# Students	1	1	4	0	163	169
% of total	0	0	2	0	96	
SEWELL-ANDERSON						
# Students	2	2	0	0	184	188
% of total	1	1	0	0	97	
SHOEMAKER						
# Students	11	6	1	0	184	202
% of total	5	2	0	0	91	
SISSON						
# Students	5	4	10	0	423	442
% of total	1	0	2	0	95	
TRACY						
# Students	15	5	3	0	356	379
% of total	3	1	0	0	93	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

LYNN

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
WASHINGTON COMMUNITY						
# Students	65	76	39	1	174	355
% of total	18	21	10	0	49	
BREED JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	81	69	3	2	612	767
% of total	10	8	0	0	79	
EASTERN JR HIGH						
# Students	65	94	16	3	626	804
% of total	8	11	1	0	77	
PICKERING JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	7	5	1	1	447	461
% of total	1	1	0	0	96	
ASTOR						
# Students	1	2	0	0	28	31
% of total	3	6	0	0	90	
CLASSICAL HIGH						
# Students	115	38	3	2	707	865
% of total	13	4	0	0	81	
LYNN ENGLISH HIGH						
# Students	56	97	34	0	1441	1628
% of total	3	5	2	0	88	
VOC TECH INSTITUTE						
# Students	62	54	6	3	867	992
% of total	6	5	0	0	87	
District Totals						
# of Students	912	871	186	14	9493	11476
% of Total	7	7	1	0	82	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

MASHPEE

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
MASHPEE MIDDLE SCHOOL						
# Students	39	0	0	66	400	505
% of total	7	0	0	13	79	
District Totals						
# of Students	39	0	0	66	400	505
% of Total	7	0	0	13	79	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

MEDFORD

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
COLUMBUS						
# Students	4	0	4	0	158	166
% of total	2	0	2	0	95	
DANE						
# Students	5	0	5	0	336	346
% of total	1	0	1	0	97	
DAVENPORT						
# Students	1	4	6	0	236	247
% of total	0	1	2	0	95	
FOREST PARK						
# Students	0	0	2	0	141	143
% of total	0	0	1	0	98	
FRANKLIN						
# Students	3	0	0	2	227	234
% of total	1	0	0	0	97	
GLEASON						
# Students	2	0	0	0	214	216
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
KENNEDY						
# Students	6	1	8	0	578	593
% of total	1	0	1	0	97	
MEDFORD						
# Students	3	2	5	0	247	257
% of total	1	0	1	0	96	
OSGOOD						
# Students	7	0	0	0	329	336
% of total	2	0	0	0	97	
HOBBS JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	114	9	8	0	412	543
% of total	20	1	1	0	75	
MILTON FULLER ROBERTS JR						
# Students	4	9	0	0	384	397
% of total	1	2	0	0	96	
MEDFORD HIGH						
# Students	84	0	17	1	1655	1757
% of total	4	0	0	0	94	
CURTIS SPED SEC						
# Students	0	0	0	0	31	31
% of total	0	0	0	0	100	
MEDFORD VOC TECH HIGH						
# Students	12	0	1	0	463	476
% of total	2	0	0	0	9	
District Totals						
# of Students	245	25	56	3	5411	5742
% of Total	4	0	0	0	94	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

MASHPEE

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
MASHPEE MIDDLE SCHOOL						
# Students	39	0	0	66	480	585
% of total	7	0	0	13	79	
District Totals						
# of Students	39	0	0	66	480	585
% of Total	7	0	0	13	79	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

MEDFORD

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
COLUMBUS						
# Students	4	0	4	0	158	166
% of total	2	0	2	0	95	
DARE						
# Students	5	0	5	0	336	346
% of total	1	0	1	0	97	
DAVENPORT						
# Students	1	4	6	0	236	247
% of total	0	1	2	0	95	
FOREST PARK						
# Students	0	0	2	0	141	143
% of total	0	0	1	0	98	
FRANKLIN						
# Students	3	0	0	2	227	234
% of total	1	0	0	0	97	
GLEASON						
# Students	2	0	0	0	214	216
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
KENNEDY						
# Students	6	1	8	0	578	593
% of total	1	0	1	0	97	
MEDFORD						
# Students	3	2	5	0	247	257
% of total	1	0	1	0	96	
OSGOOD						
# Students	7	0	0	0	329	336
% of total	2	0	0	0	97	
HOBBS JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	114	9	8	0	412	543
% of total	20	1	1	0	75	
MILTON FULLER ROBERTS JR						
# Students	4	9	0	0	384	397
% of total	1	2	0	0	96	
MEDFORD HIGH						
# Students	84	0	17	1	1655	1757
% of total	4	0	0	0	94	
CURTIS SPED SEC						
# Students	0	0	0	0	31	31
% of total	0	0	0	0	100	
MEDFORD VOC TECH HIGH						
# Students	12	0	1	0	463	476
% of total	2	0	0	0	97	
District Totals						
# of Students	245	25	56	3	5411	5742
% of Total	4	0	0	0	94	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1,1984 Data Census

NEW BEDFORD

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
ASHLEY						
# Students	5	1	0	0	367	373
% of total	1	0	0	0	98	
BROOKS						
# Students	75	7	6	0	216	304
% of total	24	2	1	0	71	
CAMPBELL						
# Students	63	54	1	0	228	346
% of total	18	15	0	0	65	
CONSLON						
# Students	14	0	0	0	355	369
% of total	3	0	0	0	96	
CARNEY						
# Students	275	76	7	0	324	682
% of total	40	11	1	0	47	
DEVALLES						
# Students	9	6	3	0	539	557
% of total	1	1	0	0	96	
DUNBAR						
# Students	20	9	0	0	126	155
% of total	12	5	0	0	81	
GOMES						
# Students	167	129	7	0	424	727
% of total	22	17	1	0	58	
HANNIGAN						
# Students	9	25	0	0	341	375
% of total	2	6	0	0	90	
HATHAWAY						
# Students	71	10	0	0	226	307
% of total	23	3	0	0	73	
HAYDEN/MCFADDEN						
# Students	40	144	2	0	769	955
% of total	4	15	0	0	80	
KEMPTON						
# Students	28	2	0	0	126	156
% of total	17	1	0	0	80	
LINCOLN						
# Students	4	5	0	0	358	367
% of total	1	1	0	0	97	
MT PLEASANT						
# Students	74	52	0	0	235	361
% of total	20	14	0	0	65	
OTTIWELL						
# Students	12	13	3	0	463	491
% of total	2	2	0	0	94	
PARKER						
# Students	52	61	0	0	364	477
% of total	10	12	0	0	76	
PHILLIPS AVENUE						
# Students	1	11	0	0	204	216
% of total	0	5	0	0	94	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

NEW BEDFORD

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
PULASKI						
# Students	21	10	0	0	361	392
% of total	5	2	0	0	92	
RODMAN						
# Students	44	10	2	0	160	216
% of total	20	4	0	0	74	
SWIFT						
# Students	5	1	0	0	202	208
% of total	2	0	0	0	97	
TAYLOR						
# Students	0	6	2	0	279	287
% of total	0	2	0	0	97	
WINSLOW						
# Students	11	1	0	0	332	344
% of total	3	0	0	0	96	
KEITH JR HIGH						
# Students	192	50	1	12	589	844
% of total	22	5	0	1	69	
NORMANDIN JR HIGH						
# Students	41	66	0	0	761	868
% of total	4	7	0	0	87	
ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH						
# Students	62	52	2	0	566	682
% of total	9	7	0	0	82	
NEW BEDFORD HIGH						
# Students	482	292	6	1	2373	3074
% of total	13	9	0	0	77	
District Totals						
# of Students	1697	1093	42	13	11288	14133
% of Total	12	7	0	0	79	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

REVERE

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
AUGUSTINE C WHELAN MEM						
# Students	13	5	10	0	712	740
% of total	1	0	1	0	96	
BEECHMONT						
# Students	2	6	38	0	606	652
% of total	0	0	5	0	92	
ABRAHAM LINCOLN						
# Students	0	0	3	0	589	592
% of total	0	0	0	0	99	
WILLIAM MCKINLEY						
# Students	5	5	1	0	311	322
% of total	1	1	0	0	96	
PAUL REVERE						
# Students	2	0	6	0	422	430
% of total	0	0	1	0	98	
GARFIELD						
# Students	0	23	112	0	353	488
% of total	0	4	22	0	72	
REVERE HIGH						
# Students	0	5	85	0	1534	1624
% of total	0	0	5	0	94	
District Totals						
# of Students	22	44	255	0	4527	4848
% of Total	0	0	5	0	93	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1,1984 Data Census

SALEM

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
BATES						
# Students	3	9	2	0	292	306
% of total	0	2	0	0	95	
BENTLEY						
# Students	7	69	5	0	173	254
% of total	2	27	1	0	68	
CARLTON						
# Students	7	0	0	3	162	172
% of total	4	0	0	1	94	
MANN LABORATORY						
# Students	24	46	6	0	476	552
% of total	4	8	1	0	86	
WITCHCRAFT HEIGHTS						
# Students	10	17	13	0	478	518
% of total	1	3	2	0	92	
MIDDLE SCHOOL WEST						
# Students	12	27	5	0	626	670
% of total	1	4	0	0	93	
MIDDLE SCHOOL EAST						
# Students	4	46	4	2	231	287
% of total	1	16	1	0	80	
SALEM HIGH						
# Students	23	114	6	1	1277	1421
% of total	1	8	0	0	89	
District Totals						
# of Students	90	328	41	6	3707	4172
% of Total	2	7	0	0	88	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1,1984 Data Census

SPRINGFIELD

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
ARMORY						
# Students	119	183	11	0	247	560
% of total	21	32	1	0	44	
BALLIET						
# Students	134	12	2	0	164	712
% of total	42	3	0	0	52	
BOWLES						
# Students	83	132	0	0	170	385
% of total	21	34	0	0	44	
BRIGHTWOOD						
# Students	54	304	0	0	64	422
% of total	12	72	0	0	15	
BROOKINGS						
# Students	169	242	12	0	194	617
% of total	27	39	1	0	31	
BRUNTON						
# Students	199	15	1	0	240	455
% of total	43	3	0	0	52	
DEBERRY						
# Students	153	177	1	0	67	398
% of total	38	44	0	0	16	
DORMAN						
# Students	158	46	0	0	142	346
% of total	45	13	0	0	41	
ELLS						
# Students	105	34	1	0	79	219
% of total	47	15	0	0	36	
GLENWOOD						
# Students	63	170	3	0	86	322
% of total	19	52	0	0	26	
GLICKMAN						
# Students	134	26	2	0	152	314
% of total	42	8	0	0	48	
FREEDMAN						
# Students	94	26	2	0	142	264
% of total	35	9	0	0	53	
HARRIS						
# Students	64	19	0	0	220	303
% of total	21	6	0	0	72	
HOMER STREET						
# Students	223	37	1	0	102	363
% of total	61	10	0	0	28	
HOWARD STREET						
# Students	126	214	3	0	88	431
% of total	29	49	0	0	20	
INDIAN ORCHARD						
# Students	113	57	1	0	274	445
% of total	25	12	0	0	61	
KINSINGTON AVENUE						
# Students	123	69	14	0	255	461
% of total	26	14	3	0	55	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

SPRINGFIELD

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	otal
LIBERTY						
# Students	82	78	2	0	191	353
% of total	23	22	0	0	54	
LINCOLN						
# Students	24	464	4	0	81	573
% of total	4	80	0	0	14	
MEMORIAL						
# Students	38	14	2	0	202	256
% of total	14	5	0	0	78	
LYNCH						
# Students	97	14	4	0	190	305
% of total	31	4	1	0	62	
POTTENGER						
# Students	97	238	3	0	208	546
% of total	17	43	0	0	38	
SIXTEEN ACRES						
# Students	109	108	4	0	276	497
% of total	21	21	0	0	55	
SUMNER AVENUE						
# Students	100	90	8	0	242	440
% of total	22	20	1	0	55	
BEAL						
# Students	40	13	1	0	169	223
% of total	17	5	0	0	75	
WARNER						
# Students	146	31	3	1	191	372
% of total	39	8	0	0	51	
WASHINGTON						
# Students	82	27	4	0	313	426
% of total	19	6	0	0	73	
WHITE						
# Students	79	90	4	0	198	371
% of total	21	24	1	0	53	
NEW NORTH COMMUNITY						
# Students	198	527	5	0	286	1016
% of total	19	51	0	0	28	
PUPIL ADJUSTMENT CENTER						
# Students	29	19	0	0	30	78
% of total	37	24	0	0	38	
CHESTNUT STREET JR HIGH						
# Students	95	728	5	0	140	968
% of total	9	75	0	0	14	
JOHN J DUGGAN JR HIGH						
# Students	343	91	4	1	306	745
% of total	46	12	0	0	41	
FOREST PARK JR HIGH						
# Students	167	136	8	0	569	880
% of total	18	15	0	0	64	
JOHN F KENNEDY JR HIGH						
# Students	244	108	3	0	289	644
% of total	37	16	0	0	44	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

SPRINGFIELD

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
M MARCUS KILEY JR HIGH						
# Students	329	25	3	7	727	1091
% of total	30	2	0	0	66	
VAN SICKLE JR HIGH						
# Students	313	272	13	0	383	981
% of total	31	27	1	0	39	
ALTERNATI[illegible]R HIGH						
# Students	24	16	1	0	28	69
% of total	34	23	1	0	40	
CLASSICAL HIGH						
# Students	310	65	23	1	1191	1590
% of total	19	4	1	0	74	
HIGH SCHOOL OF COMMERCE						
# Students	536	338	4	0	383	1261
% of total	42	26	0	0	30	
TECHNICAL HIGH						
# Students	407	259	4	0	141	811
% of total	50	31	0	0	17	
PUTNAM VOC TECH HIGH SCH						
# Students	341	267	0	0	732	1340
% of total	25	19	0	0	54	
SHRINERS HOSPITAL						
# Students	0	8	1	0	16	25
% of total	0	32	4	0	64	
District Totals						
# of Students	6344	5789	167	10	10168	22478
% of Total	28	25	0	0	45	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1,1984 Data Census

WALTHAM

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	As Ind	White	Total
BANKS						
# Students	8	12	3	0	258	281
% of total	2	4	1	0	91	
BRIGHT						
# Students	2	7	3	0	126	138
% of total	1	5	2	0	91	
FITCH						
# Students	14	52	8	0	205	279
% of total	5	18	2	0	73	
MCARTHUR						
# Students	13	15	7	0	357	392
% of total	3	3	1	0	91	
NORTHEAST						
# Students	5	9	16	0	319	349
% of total	1	2	4	0	91	
PLYMPTON						
# Students	13	83	7	0	319	422
% of total	3	19	1	0	75	
FITZGERAL						
# Students	6	7	4	0	207	224
% of total	2	3	1	0	92	
WHITTEMORE						
# Students	13	21	27	1	296	358
% of total	3	5	7	0	82	
JOHN F KENNEDY MIDDLE						
# Students	7	5	5	0	446	463
% of total	1	1	1	0	96	
CENTRAL MIDDLE						
# Students	17	71	25	0	509	619
% of total	2	11	4	0	82	
SOUTH MIDDLE						
# Students	7	29	1	0	350	387
% of total	1	7	0	0	90	
WALTHAM SR HIGH						
# Students	39	74	57	0	1849	2019
% of total	1	3	2	0	91	
WALTHAM VOCATIONAL HIGH						
# Students	2	16	0	0	292	310
% of total	0	5	0	0	94	
District Totals						
# of Students	143	401	163	1	5333	6241
% of Total	2	6	2	0	88	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

WORCESTER

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
ADAMS STREET						
# Students	38	31	1	0	100	162
% of total	18	19	0	0	61	
BELMONT STREET COMMUNITY						
# Students	46	236	22	0	239	543
% of total	8	43	4	0	44	
WAWECUS ROAD						
# Students	5	2	1	0	204	212
% of total	2	0	0	0	96	
BURNCOAT ST ELEM						
# Students	55	55	0	0	194	304
% of total	18	18	0	0	63	
CANTERBURY STREET						
# Students	30	27	68	0	247	372
% of total	8	7	18	0	66	
CHANDLER ELEM COMMUNITY						
# Students	47	119	2	5	151	324
% of total	14	36	0	1	46	
CLARK STREET COMMUNITY						
# Students	40	62	3	1	250	356
% of total	11	17	0	0	70	
COLUMBUS PARK						
# Students	59	79	13	0	264	415
% of total	14	19	3	0	63	
DARTMOUTH STREET						
# Students	4	4	34	0	249	291
% of total	1	1	11	0	85	
DOWNING STREET						
# Students	30	49	7	1	174	260
% of total	11	18	2	0	66	
FLAGG STREET						
# Students	8	3	7	0	443	461
% of total	1	0	1	0	96	
ELM PARK COMMUNITY						
# Students	68	134	24	2	261	489
% of total	13	27	4	0	53	
FREELAND STREET						
# Students	10	15	5	0	203	233
% of total	4	6	2	0	87	
GAGE STREET						
# Students	29	62	3	0	136	230
% of total	12	26	1	0	59	
GATES LANDE						
# Students	7	12	6	0	387	412
% of total	1	2	1	0	93	
GRAFTON STREET						
# Students	19	15	0	0	218	252
% of total	7	5	0	0	86	
GRANITE STREET						
# Students	7	1	5	0	172	185
% of total	3	0	2	0	92	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

WORCESTER

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
GREENDALE						
# Students	5	1	0	0	334	340
% of total	1	0	0	0	98	
HARLOW STREET						
# Students	36	49	12	0	188	285
% of total	12	17	4	0	65	
HEARD STREET						
# Students	2	3	4	0	146	155
% of total	1	1	2	0	94	
LAKE VIEW						
# Students	13	6	2	0	254	275
% of total	4	2	0	0	92	
LINCOLN STREET						
# Students	32	71	3	1	132	239
% of total	13	29	1	0	55	
NEW LUDLOW						
# Students	2	0	4	0	141	147
% of total	1	0	2	0	95	
MAY STREET						
# Students	10	3	9	0	282	304
% of total	3	0	2	0	92	
MCGRATH ELEM						
# Students	8	11	0	0	250	269
% of total	2	4	0	0	92	
MIDLAND STREET						
# Students	6	1	5	0	255	267
% of total	2	0	1	0	95	
MILL SHAW						
# Students	9	9	1	0	117	136
% of total	6	6	0	0	86	
MILLBURY STREET						
# Students	6	0	1	1	143	151
% of total	3	0	0	0	94	
NELSON PLACE						
# Students	11	9	3	1	417	441
% of total	2	2	0	0	94	
NORBACK AVENUE						
# Students	10	11	5	0	170	196
% of total	5	5	2	0	86	
QUINSIGAMOND						
# Students	16	28	2	0	267	313
% of total	5	8	0	0	85	
RICE SQUARE						
# Students	0	4	6	0	372	382
% of total	0	1	1	0	97	
ROOSEVELT						
# Students	7	9	3	0	131	150
% of total	4	6	2	0	87	
ST NICHOLAS AVE COMM SCH						
# Students	9	196	0	0	210	415
% of total	2	47	0	0	50	

BEST COPY

1984 Racial Enrollments — from October 1, 1984 Data Census

WORCESTER

School	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Am Ind	White	Total
TATNUCK						
# Students	20	27	4	2	362	415
% of total	4	6	0	0	87	
THORNDYKE ROAD						
# Students	25	45	0	1	187	258
% of total	9	17	0	0	72	
UNION HILL						
# Students	26	35	3	0	375	439
% of total	5	7	0	0	85	
WEST TATNUCK						
# Students	9	13	0	0	291	313
% of total	2	4	0	0	92	
WOODLAND ST COMMUNITY						
# Students	69	191	12	7	177	456
% of total	15	41	2	1	38	
VERNON HILL SCHOOL						
# Students	3	12	2	0	416	433
% of total	0	2	0	0	96	
BURNCOAT STREET JR HIGH						
# Students	38	136	1	6	412	605
% of total	4	25	0	0	68	
FOREST GROVE JR HIGH						
# Students	52	64	12	9	686	823
% of total	6	7	1	1	83	
WORCESTER EAST MIDDLE						
# Students	44	72	27	4	603	750
% of total	5	9	3	0	80	
SULLIVAN MIDDLE						
# Students	42	65	7	1	422	537
% of total	7	12	1	0	78	
BURNCOAT SENIOR HIGH						
# Students	52	143	23	0	919	1137
% of total	4	12	2	0	80	
DOHERTY MEMORIAL HIGH						
# Students	82	99	34	4	1182	1401
% of total	5	7	2	0	84	
NORTH HIGH						
# Students	68	189	20	2	707	986
% of total	6	19	2	0	71	
SOUTH HIGH COMMUNITY						
# Students	69	138	20	1	1058	1286
% of total	5	10	1	0	82	
District Totals						
# of Students	1267	2565	426	49	15498	19805
% of Total	6	12	2	0	78	

BEST COPY

Enrollment Data By Minority/Income

The tables in this section show school enrollments for the following districts: Boston, Brockton, Cambridge, Chelsea, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, New Bedford, Springfield and Worcester. They provide profiles of each school in these systems by race and income between 1978 and 1983. The reader should be able to identify patterns of change in the composition of student bodies and patterns of disproportionate concentration of students by race and income.

Data are provided for three years: 1978, 1981, 1983. For each year, the percentage of minority students and the percentage of low income students enrolled in the school are given under the column heading "School Percent." In addition, the variation between the school's enrollment and the district-wide average is indicated under the column heading "Above/Below District %."

An example is the Longfellow School in Cambridge, which shows the following for 1983.

	School Percent	Above/Below District %
Minority	48.93	7.82
Low Income	43.67	-1.83

The minority enrollment at the Longfellow in 1983 was 48.93%, which was 7.82 percentage points above the average minority enrollment in Cambridge. The low income enrollment was 43.67%, which was 1.83 percentage points below the average low income enrollment in Cambridge.

The enrollment at the Longfellow was, then, fairly representative of the overall system enrollment. As a rule, low numbers in the "Above/Below" column indicate that the enrollment of the school in question approximated the district averages. Conversely, high positive numbers in the "Above/Below" column indicate that the minority (or low income) enrollment at the school was much higher than in the district overall, and high negative numbers indicate that the minority (or low income) enrollment at the school was much lower than in the district.

The data for these tables are taken from Tables 3 & 6 of the Individual School Report, which is submitted annually by each public school to the Department of Education. A word of caution is in order regarding the low income data (Table 6). Individual schools are given much latitude in defining and identifying low income students, and the Department has not had the resources to verify low income enrollments. Anomalies are inevitable especially, one would suspect, at the high school level where free breakfasts and other services requiring low-income head counts are less likely. As an example, both the Burke and Dorchester High Schools in Boston reported, respectively, 21% and 22% low income students in 1983 — surely much lower than the actual low income enrollment. There are also serious fluctuations in the reporting of low income data. For example, the Burke reported that 78% of its students were low income in 1978 — there is a difference of almost 60 percentage points between the 1978 figure and the data from the 1980's.

An attempt was made to adjust for these fluctuations. An average was obtained for each district for each of the six years from 1978 to 1983. Then the six averages were averaged to eliminate anomalous data. It was this average of the averages for each district that was used to compute the variation of the schools' low income percentage from their districts' percentage.

BEST COPY

BOSTON

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR: Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
(closed)						
Minority	78.95	18.78	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	100.00	41.78	0.00	0	0.00	0
AGASSIZ						
Minority	64.64	4.39	74.81	7.82	84.31	12.75
Low Inc	60.97	2.67	70.17	11.87	76.45	18.15
A HAMILTON						
Minority	63.64	3.39	79.07	12.08	84.18	12.62
Low Inc	51.94	-6.36	72.56	14.26	83.81	25.51
JACKSON MANN						
Minority	65.94	5.69	69.63	2.64	81.39	9.83
Low Inc	74.55	16.25	80.87	22.57	87.74	29.44
BEETHOVEN						
Minority	43.04	-17.21	58.89	-8.10	62.29	-9.27
Low Inc	52.32	-5.98	55.83	-2.47	82.85	24.55
(closed)						
Minority	67.95	7.78	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	100.00	41.78	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	47.32	-12.93	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	100.00	41.78	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	77.58	17.33	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	100.00	41.78	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	58.56	-1.69	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	72.36	14.06	0.00	0	0.00	0
CARTER DEVLP DAY CARE						
Minority	36.85	-23.40	55.18	-11.81	70.38	-1.18
Low Inc	76.31	18.01	86.20	27.90	100.00	41.70
(closed)						
Minority	77.18	16.93	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	61.73	3.43	0.00	0	0.00	0
CHARLES E MACKEY						
Minority	68.77	8.52	62.55	-4.44	73.15	1.59
Low Inc	64.79	6.49	46.38	-11.92	56.91	-1.39
C SUMNER						
Minority	49.21	-11.84	59.91	-7.08	59.26	-12.30
Low Inc	57.85	-.45	62.31	4.81	72.09	13.79
C TAYLOR						
Minority	68.83	8.58	82.15	13.16	84.06	12.50
Low Inc	51.69	-6.61	46.24	-12.06	76.50	18.20
C WILD						
Minority	53.47	-4.78	61.72	-5.27	72.27	0.71
Low Inc	78.12	19.82	76.17	17.87	77.31	19.01

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR: Low Income from Table 6, ISR. Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
D ALIGHIERI						
Minority	13.89	-47.16	15.20	-51.79	21.34	-50.22
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	86.40	28.10	84.00	25.70
(closed)						
Minority	54.02	-6.23	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	97.59	29.29	0.00	0	0.00	0
D ELLIS						
Minority	86.14	25.89	87.25	20.26	89.81	18.25
Low Inc	77.33	19.03	28.18	-38.12	72.63	14.33
DEARBORN						
Minority	61.26	1.11	71.74	4.75	74.94	3.38
Low Inc	94.59	36.29	81.98	23.68	85.16	26.86
DENNIS C HALEY						
Minority	57.76	-2.49	63.93	-3.06	75.25	3.69
Low Inc	54.31	-3.99	56.32	-1.98	74.91	16.61
D MCKAY						
Minority	48.31	-11.94	58.81	-8.18	70.94	-.62
Low Inc	58.13	-.17	78.40	20.10	54.30	-4.00
E EVERETT						
Minority	59.75	-.50	62.18	-4.81	70.30	-1.26
Low Inc	71.88	13.58	67.43	9.13	75.31	17.01
(closed)						
Minority	51.05	-9.20	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	70.62	12.32	0.00	0	0.00	0
E GREENWOOD						
Minority	57.79	-2.46	68.37	1.38	69.74	-1.82
Low Inc	59.42	1.12	115.32	57.02	65.61	7.31
ELIOT						
Minority	72.31	12.06	85.23	18.24	83.94	12.38
Low Inc	98.56	40.26	88.06	29.76	89.63	31.33
(closed)						
Minority	25.55	-34.70	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
E MENDELL						
Minority	78.75	18.50	84.45	17.46	80.10	8.54
Low Inc	78.33	20.03	83.11	24.81	85.64	27.34
E FIELD						
Minority	81.56	21.41	84.64	17.65	85.02	13.46
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	46.42	-13.83	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	47.25	-11.05	0.00	0	0.00	0
FARRAGUT						
Minority	82.36	22.11	79.00	12.01	83.03	11.47
Low Inc	76.81	18.51	69.86	11.56	81.91	23.61

BEST COPY

BOSTON

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
(closed)						
Minority	45.38	-14.27	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	81.62	23.30	0.00	0	0.00	0
E PARKMAN						
Minority	66.34	6.69	76.48	9.49	73.69	2.13
Low Inc	74.10	15.80	90.33	32.03	89.47	31.17
FRANK V THOMPSON MIDDLE						
Minority	77.61	17.36	82.09	15.10	86.84	14.48
Low Inc	56.50	-1.80	50.45	-7.85	61.19	2.89
F ROOSEVELT						
Minority	58.70	-1.55	46.48	-20.51	54.83	-16.73
Low Inc	55.65	-2.65	57.27	-1.03	63.45	5.15
(closed)						
Minority	70.51	10.36	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	47.92	-10.38	0.00	0	0.00	0
G CONLEY						
Minority	34.49	-25.76	56.15	-10.84	60.74	-10.82
Low Inc	34.48	-23.82	57.21	-1.09	65.64	7.34
H BALDWIN						
Minority	77.01	16.76	83.28	16.29	88.34	16.78
Low Inc	87.22	28.92	74.24	15.94	21.25	-37.85
(closed)						
Minority	43.27	-16.98	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	43.26	-15.04	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	60.31	0.06	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	88.54	30.24	0.00	0	0.00	0
H GREW						
Minority	51.99	-9.26	56.57	-10.42	66.85	-4.71
Low Inc	60.31	2.81	62.12	3.82	69.51	11.21
H HIGGINSON						
Minority	90.74	30.49	84.69	17.70	72.00	0.44
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	80.18	21.88	87.42	29.12
PHYLLIS WHEATLEY MIDDLE						
Minority	59.20	-1.85	64.37	-2.62	74.70	3.14
Low Inc	57.32	-.98	50.27	-8.03	71.08	12.78
H ODONNELL						
Minority	7.59	-52.66	6.59	-60.40	12.04	-59.52
Low Inc	71.11	12.81	76.35	18.85	94.60	36.30
J CONDON						
Minority	48.10	-12.15	50.81	-16.18	53.85	-17.71
Low Inc	47.95	-10.35	89.78	31.48	88.79	30.49
J GARFIELD						
Minority	68.86	8.61	65.64	-1.35	65.72	-5.84
Low Inc	39.42	-18.88	90.30	22.00	85.64	27.34

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
J HENNIGAN						
Minority	65.99	5.74	73.33	6.34	78.26	6.70
Low Inc	79.65	21.35	74.44	16.14	83.85	25.55
J CHITTICK						
Minority	82.64	22.39	85.38	18.39	86.19	14.63
Low Inc	40.00	-18.30	45.32	-12.98	53.26	-5.04
JAMES OTIS						
Minority	20.65	-39.60	18.68	-48.11	27.12	-44.44
Low Inc	63.83	10.73	84.43	26.13	78.87	20.57
JOHN CHEVERUS MIDDLE						
Minority	4.30	-55.95	4.66	-62.33	5.56	-66.80
Low Inc	51.50	-5.80	44.76	-13.54	52.08	-6.22
J KENNEDY						
Minority	86.91	26.66	88.89	21.90	87.94	16.38
Low Inc	35.81	36.71	78.81	20.51	81.28	22.98
J HOLLAND						
Minority	84.68	24.43	86.53	19.54	88.84	17.28
Low Inc	82.10	23.80	93.65	35.35	67.89	9.59
(closed)						
Minority	62.57	2.32	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	92.61	34.31	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	14.37	-45.88	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	85.63	27.33	0.00	0	0.00	0
J PHILBRICK						
Minority	100.00	39.75	51.36	-15.63	54.96	-16.60
Low Inc	59.67	1.37	66.66	8.36	65.76	7.46
J MARSHALL						
Minority	80.03	19.78	82.91	15.92	88.95	17.39
Low Inc	84.72	26.42	62.75	4.45	76.00	17.70
JOHN W MCCORMACK						
Minority	42.60	-17.65	48.58	-18.41	53.68	-17.88
Low Inc	99.59	41.29	75.64	17.34	74.41	16.11
J WINTHROP						
Minority	78.09	17.84	73.46	6.47	63.75	-7.81
Low Inc	20.78	-37.52	68.24	9.94	73.75	15.45
J TYNAN						
Minority	32.71	-27.54	33.23	-33.76	59.57	-11.99
Low Inc	66.82	8.52	67.08	8.78	77.77	19.47
J HURLEY						
Minority	82.23	21.98	88.96	21.97	86.39	14.83
Low Inc	87.44	29.14	62.50	4.28	88.61	30.31
J LEE						
Minority	79.84	18.79	72.12	5.13	77.81	6.25
Low Inc	97.59	39.29	64.85	6.55	93.04	34.74

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
J MANNING						
Minority	62.50	2.25	63.24	-3.75	69.82	-1.74
Low Inc	67.61	9.31	53.23	4.93	78.61	20.31
(closed)						
Minority	24.51	-35.74	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	80.13	21.83	0.00	0	0.00	0
J MILMER						
Minority	40.40	-19.85	46.40	-20.59	57.79	-13.77
Low Inc	37.93	-20.37	40.99	-17.31	52.76	-5.54
HARVARD-KENT						
Minority	64.16	3.91	77.78	10.79	78.25	6.69
Low Inc	80.32	22.02	79.46	21.16	85.93	27.63
H LONGFELLOW						
Minority	56.93	-3.32	63.38	-2.61	70.13	-1.43
Low Inc	60.92	2.62	62.55	4.25	74.02	15.72
L STONE						
Minority	83.10	22.85	86.70	19.71	87.59	16.03
Low Inc	98.59	40.29	98.62	40.32	95.42	37.12
M BRADLSY						
Minority	6.25	-54.00	5.89	-61.10	16.02	-55.54
Low Inc	65.62	7.32	67.15	8.85	74.45	16.15
M FULLER						
Minority	75.68	15.43	77.65	10.66	83.34	11.78
Low Inc	84.68	26.38	81.96	23.66	87.91	29.61
(closed)						
Minority	86.16	25.91	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	83.84	25.54	0.00	0	0.00	0
MATTAHUNT						
Minority	65.82	5.57	78.09	3.10	63.61	-1.95
Low Inc	55.60	-2.70	72.02	13.72	74.88	16.58
MATHER						
Minority	68.53	8.28	76.39	9.40	80.40	8.84
Low Inc	93.06	34.76	83.04	24.74	88.03	29.73
M TOBIN						
Minority	88.87	28.62	86.69	19.70	87.27	15.71
Low Inc	95.96	37.66	72.05	13.75	73.43	15.13
PERKINS						
Minority	26.32	-33.93	34.10	-32.89	42.74	-28.82
Low Inc	97.57	39.27	75.00	16.70	72.22	13.92
MOZART						
Minority	53.82	-6.43	67.53	0.54	72.79	1.23
Low Inc	60.67	5.37	80.92	22.62	85.20	26.90
R MURPHY						
Minority	64.83	4.58	70.84	3.35	78.92	7.36
Low Inc	99.51	41.21	64.34	6.04	81.32	23.82

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
W HALE						
Minority	66.67	[illegible].42	66.36	-.63	72.34	0.78
Low Inc	89.65	31.35	82.24	23.94	73.78	15.48
(closed)						
Minority	54.04	3.79	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	50.30	-8.30	0.00	0	0.00	0
D BERRY						
Minority	20.89	-40.16	34.30	-32.09	41.84	-29.72
Low Inc	96.86	37.76	63.08	4.78	78.57	20.27
G+RENBERGER						
Minority	55.21	-5.84	65.11	-1.88	77.26	5.70
Low Inc	55.90	-2.40	65.66	7.36	76.63	18.33
P LYNCON						
Minority	43.16	-17.09	40.12	-26.87	30.22	-41.34
Low Inc	44.52	-13.78	35.59	-22.71	32.37	-25.93
P KENNEDY						
Minority	8.68	-59.65	5.00	-61.99	9.50	-62.06
Low Inc	60.94	2.64	54.09	-4.21	66.48	8.18
P OHEARN						
Minority	40.89	-19.36	52.43	-14.56	56.67	-14.89
Low Inc	98.52	40.22	67.96	9.66	82.00	23.70
P DEVER						
Minority	59.70	-.55	64.32	-2.67	68.68	-2.88
Low Inc	85.75	27.45	84.64	26.34	91.76	33.46
P A SHAW						
Minority	79.81	19.56	86.84	19.85	74.73	3.17
Low Inc	54.80	-3.50	156.58	98.28	70.69	12.39
(closed)						
Minority	5.17	-55.38	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	63.74	11.44	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	74.76	14.51	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	96.68	38.38	0.00	0	0.00	0
P BATES						
Minority	52.40	-7.85	49.32	-17.97	54.09	-17.47
Low Inc	31.35	-26.94	78.58	12.28	75.51	17.21
(closed)						
Minority	79.26	19.01	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	82.44	24.14	0.00	0	0.00	0
D DICKERMAN						
Minority	89.49	29.15	87.46	28.47	88.65	17.09
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	98.99	32.69	98.19	39.80
QUINCY						
Minority	90.80	20.55	82.65	15.66	86.68	15.12
Low Inc	79.20	20.90	62.30	4.00	91.06	32.76

BEST COPY

BOSTON

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1979, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3. ISR: Low Income from Table 6. ISR. Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1979-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1979 School Percent	1979 Above/Below District %	1981 School Percent	1981 Above/Below District %	1983 School Percent	1983 Above/Below District %
R EMERSON						
Minority	80.56	20.31	81.28	14.29	83.43	11.87
Low Inc	92.59	34.29	89.64	31.34	79.55	21.25
(closed)						
Minority	58.35	8.10	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	68.34	10.04	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	49.38	-11.17	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	88.56	30.26	0.00	0	0.00	0
R CLAP						
Minority	42.07	-18.18	45.13	-21.86	50.30	-21.26
Low Inc	86.20	27.90	79.48	21.18	71.00	12.70
S ADAMS						
Minority	6.48	-53.85	15.69	-51.30	18.50	-53.06
Low Inc	72.67	14.37	74.01	15.71	67.50	9.20
S MASON						
Minority	61.38	1.13	57.42	-9.57	67.48	-4.08
Low Inc	0.00	0	98.70	40.40	100.00	41.70
S GREENWOOD						
Minority	69.79	9.54	83.86	16.87	82.58	11.02
Low Inc	58.83	10.53	86.77	28.47	89.54	31.24
(closed)						
Minority	57.77	-2.48	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	53.41	-4.89	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	19.22	-41.33	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	78.81	20.51	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	20.00	-40.25	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	60.00	1.70	0.00	0	0.00	0
T ROOSEVELT MIDDLE						
Minority	81.09	20.84	84.34	17.95	84.52	12.96
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	74.32	15.72	77.10	18.88
T GARDNER						
Minority	71.70	11.45	72.00	5.81	76.15	4.59
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	97.50	39.20	95.18	36.88
T KENNY						
Minority	46.04	-14.21	56.87	-10.12	56.42	-15.14
Low Inc	46.29	-12.01	53.68	-2.62	60.25	1.95
W PRESCOTT						
Minority	60.20	-.85	57.79	-9.20	65.67	-5.89
Low Inc	76.41	18.11	65.82	7.52	70.76	12.46
(closed)						
Minority	74.07	13.32	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	89.47	31.17	0.00	0	0.00	0

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
W CHANNING						
Minority	49.83	-10.42	56.82	-10.17	64.29	-7.27
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
P ENDICOTT						
Minority	73.77	12.52	86.94	19.95	87.50	15.94
Low Inc	48.28	-10.82	61.36	3.06	83.33	25.03
W MCKINLEY						
Minority	51.52	-8.73	64.3?	-2.60	68.44	-11.12
Low Inc	84.84	26.54	72.60	14.30	6.59	-51.71
W RUSSELL						
Minority	59.75	-.50	68.27	1.28	75.43	3.87
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	92.19	33.89	94.57	35.27
W TROTTER						
Minority	59.34	-.91	56.41	-.58	74.11	2.55
Low Inc	57.68	-.62	49.60	-8.70	54.10	-4.20
WINTHROP						
Minority	53.59	-6.66	72.81	5.82	74.53	2.97
Low Inc	58.94	-7.36	65.65	7.35	73.17	14.87
HENENWAY						
Minority	58.72	-9.53	58.74	-8.25	57.43	-14.13
Low Inc	40.71	-17.59	59.79	-7.51	52.47	-5.83
J CURLEY						
Minority	57.24	-3.01	61.73	-5.26	75.09	3.53
Low Inc	79.74	21.44	0.00	0	70.70	12.40
BLACKSTONE						
Minority	85.09	24.84	90.20	23.21	90.64	19.08
Low Inc	60.88	2.58	67.40	9.10	84.16	25.86
JOSEPH H BARNES MIDDLE						
Minority	5.53	-54.72	9.56	-58.43	15.49	-56.07
Low Inc	59.97	1.67	69.47	11.17	75.00	16.70
MARTIN LUTHER KING JR MID						
Minority	59.35	-.90	68.88	1.89	78.98	7.42
Low Inc	66.05	7.75	79.59	21.29	71.90	13.60
GROVER CLEVELAND						
Minority	74.78	14.53	85.00	18.01	88.60	17.04
Low Inc	75.10	16.80	85.28	26.98	29.90	-28.40
MARY E CURLEY MIDDLE						
Minority	73.56	13.31	79.34	12.35	83.24	11.68
Low Inc	77.82	18.72	25.79	-32.51	77.46	19.16
THOMAS A EDISON JR HIGH						
Minority	69.29	9.04	75.97	8.98	79.13	7.57
Low Inc	73.37	15.07	79.64	21.34	86.49	28.19
CLARENCE R EDWARDS MIDDLE						
Minority	74.31	14.06	82.34	15.35	83.17	11.61
Low Inc	87.35	29.85	86.53	28.23	92.47	34.17

BEST COPY

BOSTON

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
PATRICK F GAVIN MIDDLE						
Minority	50.16	-18.07	49.50	-17.49	57.72	-13.94
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	60.50	2.20	65.71	7.41
OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES JR						
Minority	70.08	9.83	72.34	5.35	80.42	8.86
Low Inc	68.50	10.20	73.24	14.94	77.83	19.53
WASHINGTON IRVING MIDDLE						
Minority	48.42	-11.83	60.93	-6.06	68.75	-2.81
Low Inc	69.51	11.21	62.22	3.92	67.32	9.02
SOLOMON LEWENBERG MIDDLE						
Minority	64.43	4.18	75.44	8.45	76.93	5.37
Low Inc	72.03	13.73	50.87	-7.43	57.43	-.87
LEWIS MIDDLE SCHOOL						
Minority	73.67	13.42	83.10	16.11	78.27	6.71
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	66.54	8.24	67.39	9.09
MICHELANGELO MIDDLE						
Minority	80.13	19.88	85.53	18.54	87.60	16.04
Low Inc	79.31	21.21	92.76	34.46	84.60	27.30
WM B ROGERS MIDDLE						
Minority	58.41	-1.84	72.50	5.51	71.78	0.22
Low Inc	71.97	13.67	48.75	-9.55	36.45	-21.85
ROBERT GOULD SHAW MIDDLE						
Minority	69.57	9.32	76.17	9.18	80.46	8.90
Low Inc	75.15	16.85	78.90	20.60	73.61	15.31
WILLIAM H TAFT MIDDLE						
Minority	75.32	15.07	75.43	8.44	77.66	6.10
Low Inc	74.89	16.59	80.49	22.19	47.02	-11.28
JAMES P TIMILTY MIDDLE						
Minority	78.36	18.11	89.27	22.26	85.11	13.55
Low Inc	79.35	21.05	68.00	9.70	75.30	17.00
WOODROW WILSON MIDDLE						
Minority	75.17	14.92	82.88	15.89	87.10	15.54
Low Inc	68.42	10.12	72.78	14.48	81.90	23.60
(closed)						
Minority	81.30	21.05	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	0.00	0	0.00	0
BRIGHTON HIGH						
Minority	69.07	8.82	76.56	9.57	83.61	12.05
Low Inc	65.61	7.31	34.27	-24.83	44.39	-13.91
CHARLESTOWN HIGH						
Minority	54.17	-6.08	76.95	9.96	83.12	11.56
Low Inc	44.54	-13.56	43.16	-15.14	56.88	-1.42
DORCHESTER HIGH						
Minority	77.60	17.35	86.57	19.58	82.86	11.30
Low Inc	30.13	-28.17	18.92	-39.38	22.04	-36.26

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
JEREMIAH E BURKE HIGH						
Minority	87.16	26.91	91.75	24.76	86.18	14.62
Low Inc	78.28	19.78	23.06	-35.24	21.22	-37.08
EAST BOSTON HIGH						
Minority	17.03	-43.22	26.34	-40.65	30.71	-40.85
Low Inc	33.13	-25.17	35.76	-22.54	31.07	-27.23
THE ENGLISH HIGH						
Minority	58.74	-1.51	69.61	2.62	75.76	4.20
Low Inc	44.69	-13.61	25.89	-32.41	19.63	-38.67
MADISON PARK HIGH						
Minority	55.41	-4.84	64.77	-2.22	75.09	3.53
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	90.81	30.56	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	54.67	-3.63	0.00	0	0.00	0
BOSTON LATIN ACADEMY						
Minority	39.87	-20.38	45.53	-21.46	47.78	-23.78
Low Inc	40.34	-17.96	36.83	-21.47	29.26	-29.04
HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL						
Minority	60.04	-.21	71.58	4.59	78.88	7.32
Low Inc	17.95	-40.35	19.76	-38.54	12.53	-45.77
JAMAICA PLAIN HIGH						
Minority	74.65	14.40	81.76	14.77	82.12	10.56
Low Inc	59.44	1.14	36.06	-22.24	21.47	-36.83
BOSTON LATIN						
Minority	29.92	-30.33	35.44	-31.33	39.83	-31.73
Low Inc	8.47	-49.83	16.66	-41.62	17.84	-41.26
SOUTH BOSTON HIGH						
Minority	54.33	-5.92	61.90	-5.09	71.32	-.24
Low Inc	76.28	17.98	17.73	-40.57	29.88	-28.50
WEST ROXBURY SCH						
Minority	57.36	-2.89	59.71	-7.28	63.97	-7.59
Low Inc	12.81	-45.49	28.14	-30.16	20.18	-38.12
BOSTON TECH HIGH						
Minority	60.60	0.35	65.66	-1.33	73.29	1.73
Low Inc	41.26	-17.84	38.31	-27.99	26.10	-32.20
(closed)						
Minority	29.27	-30.98	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	70.10	9.85	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	100.20	41.73	0.00	0	0.00	0
MARIA UMANA HARBOR						
Minority	58.92	-1.33	66.97	-.82	73.65	2.09
Low Inc	44.09	-14.21	48.68	-9.62	64.43	6.13

BEST COPY

BOSTON

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983

Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
(closed)						
Minority	73.73	13.48	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	89.53	31.23	0.00	0	0.00	0
BOSTON HIGH SCHOOL						
Minority	58.49	-1.76	70.33	3.34	76.98	5.42
Low Inc	69.93	11.63	0.00	0	0.00	0
COPLEY SQ HIGH						
Minority	58.26	-1.99	64.96	-2.03	76.36	4.80
Low Inc	46.38	-11.92	11.92	-46.38	15.31	-42.99
R HERNANDEZ						
Minority	90.79	30.54	86.05	19.06	89.40	17.84
Low Inc	94.47	36.17	82.79	24.49	95.95	37.65
(closed)						
Minority	6.56	-53.69	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	5.55	-51.75	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	87.50	27.25	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	87.50	29.20	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	28.44	-31.81	35.00	-31.99	26.32	-45.24
Low Inc	9.80	-48.50	12.00	-46.38	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	53.88	-6.37	68.51	1.52	68.45	-3.11
Low Inc	78.68	12.38	88.31	22.81	95.88	36.78
(closed)						
Minority	1.97	-58.28	2.13	-64.86	1.77	-69.79
Low Inc	8.25	-50.85	6.36	-51.94	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	3.01	-57.24	3.28	-63.71	3.79	-67.77
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	71.65	11.40	0.00	0	79.56	8.00
Low Inc	92.78	34.48	0.00	0	100.00	41.70
(closed)						
Minority	75.63	15.38	88.45	21.46	85.60	14.04
Low Inc	48.75	-9.55	88.44	38.14	55.84	-3.26
(closed)						
Minority	1.25	-59.00	0.85	-66.14	0.91	-70.65
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	3.45	-56.80	0.00	0	6.90	-64.66
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	0.81	-59.44	0.35	-66.64	1.65	-69.91
Low Inc	47.16	-11.14	0.00	0	6.21	-52.89

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
(closed)						
Minority	11.91	-48.34	17.92	-49.07	14.82	-56.74
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	4.22	-56.03	4.44	-62.55	3.92	-67.64
Low Inc	29.24	-29.06	12.81	-45.49	12.57	-45.73
(closed)						
Minority	3.21	-57.04	0.67	-66.32	5.91	-65.65
Low Inc	46.91	-11.39	72.60	14.30	77.77	19.47
(closed)						
Minority	0.30	-59.95	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	39.84	-20.41	40.48	-26.51	37.24	-34.32
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	97.61	39.31	78.72	20.42
(closed)						
Minority	25.60	-34.65	21.32	-45.67	2.84	-68.72
Low Inc	20.80	-37.50	27.04	-31.26	21.69	-36.61
(closed)						
Minority	100.00	39.75	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	94.52	36.22	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	3.05	-57.20	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	33.50	-24.80	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	50.00	-10.25	38.71	-28.28	26.67	-44.89
Low Inc	8.33	-49.97	4.83	-53.47	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	0.00	0	1.36	-65.63	1.69	-69.87
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	38.89	-21.36	39.07	-27.92	35.49	-36.07
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	52.45	-7.80	75.47	8.48	78.97	7.41
Low Inc	53.00	-4.50	53.33	-4.97	34.82	-23.48
(closed)						
Minority	24.19	-36.06	44.12	-22.87	44.91	-26.55
Low Inc	100.00	41.70	73.52	15.22	78.70	20.40
(closed)						
Minority	2.05	-58.20	3.40	-63.59	4.95	-66.61
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0

BEST COPY

BOSTON

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BOSTON Public School System, 1979, 1981, 1983

Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1979		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
(closed)						
Minority	0.00	0	0.00	0	1.10	-70.46
Low Inc	19.57	-38.73	8.92	-49.38	25.09	-33.21
(closed)						
Minority	53.53	-6.72	45.24	-21.75	53.66	-17.90
Low Inc	70.42	12.12	71.42	13.12	100.00	41.70
(closed)						
Minority	16.63	-43.62	28.25	-38.74	21.94	-49.62
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BROCKTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR: Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
ARNONE COMM SCH						
Minority	38.89	17.71	31.14	16.91	39.71	23.19
Low Inc	51.68	26.99	57.78	33.09	69.60	34.91
ASHFIELD						
Minority	7.53	-3.65	7.39	-6.84	7.38	-9.14
Low Inc	34.63	-.05	26.89	-7.79	27.18	-7.50
BROCKFIELD						
Minority	8.75	-2.43	8.40	-5.83	10.76	-5.76
Low Inc	41.03	6.34	34.57	-.11	27.59	-7.09
(closed)						
Minority	3.65	-7.53	10.53	-3.70	0.00	0
Low Inc	15.50	-19.18	23.80	-10.88	0.00	0
KENNEDY						
Minority	1.46	-9.72	2.24	-11.99	4.95	-11.57
Low Inc	4.90	-29.78	0.00	0	29.68	-5.00
(closed)						
Minority	7.53	-3.65	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	55.91	21.22	0.00	0	0.00	0
DAVIS,						
Minority	14.15	2.97	17.67	3.44	16.74	0.22
Low Inc	32.15	-2.53	50.17	15.48	31.55	-3.13
(closed)						
Minority	4.70	-6.48	1.65	-12.58	0.00	0
Low Inc	16.10	-18.58	16.46	-18.22	0.00	0
FRANKLIN						
Minority	5.43	-5.75	6.54	-7.69	9.53	-6.99
Low Inc	32.54	-2.14	37.28	2.59	44.17	9.48
GILMORE						
Minority	8.52	-2.66	12.00	-2.23	12.89	-3.63
Low Inc	41.91	7.22	52.27	17.58	49.88	15.19
HANCOCK						
Minority	5.63	-5.55	7.32	-6.31	8.82	-7.70
Low Inc	12.26	-22.42	16.64	-18.04	28.06	-14.62
(closed)						
Minority	6.34	-4.24	10.15	-4.08	0.00	0
Low Inc	34.45	-.23	38.82	-4.66	0.00	0
HUNTINGTON						
Minority	5.65	-5.53	9.15	-5.08	12.28	-4.24
Low Inc	36.96	2.27	48.85	6.16	53.42	18.73
(closed)						
Minority	2.33	-8.85	9.72	-4.51	0.00	0
Low Inc	53.82	19.13	43.88	9.19	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	14.26	3.08	16.91	2.68	0.00	0
Low Inc	25.30	-9.38	19.78	-14.90	0.00	0

BEST COPY

BROCKTON

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the BROCKTON Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
RAYMOND						
Minority	18.88	7.79	23.39	9.16	26.92	10.40
Low Inc	55.81	21.12	60.05	25.36	61.71	27.02
(closed)						
Minority	27.22	16.84	29.46	15.23	0.00	0
Low Inc	73.77	39.08	86.30	51.61	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	4.59	-6.59	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	30.27	-4.41	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	10.66	-.52	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	50.15	15.46	0.00	0	0.00	0
PAINE						
Minority	30.11	18.93	47.53	33.30	45.35	28.83
Low Inc	88.70	54.01	83.16	48.47	84.78	50.09
WHITMAN						
Minority	3.18	-8.00	8.17	-6.06	8.03	-8.49
Low Inc	33.23	-1.45	29.59	-5.09	33.11	-1.57
WINTHROP						
Minority	16.17	4.99	12.17	-2.06	12.86	-3.66
Low Inc	66.16	31.47	70.27	35.58	44.64	9.95
DOWNEY						
Minority	16.05	4.87	17.76	3.53	17.94	1.42
Low Inc	35.82	1.13	39.29	4.60	45.88	11.19
EAST JUNIOR HIGH						
Minority	16.25	5.07	19.80	5.57	22.73	6.21
Low Inc	45.62	10.93	39.44	4.75	39.44	4.75
NORTH JUNIOR HIGH						
Minority	13.31	2.13	17.74	3.51	22.87	6.35
Low Inc	53.44	18.75	43.49	8.80	41.59	6.90
SOUTH JUNIOR HIGH						
Minority	7.81	-3.37	10.10	-4.13	11.63	-4.89
Low Inc	35.22	0.53	32.98	-1.70	35.24	0.55
WEST JUNIOR HIGH						
Minority	4.87	-6.31	6.61	-7.62	9.60	-6.92
Low Inc	22.27	-12.41	22.03	-12.65	23.98	-10.70
SUPPLEMENTARY SERV CTR						
Minority	12.58	1.32	22.23	8.00	0.00	0
Low Inc	100.00	65.31	77.77	43.08	100.00	65.31
BROCKTON HIGH						
Minority	11.28	0.10	13.58	-.65	15.68	-.94
Low Inc	17.87	-16.81	16.83	-17.85	19.46	-16.32
ITHAKA ALTERNATIVE HS						
Minority	3.34	-7.94	0.00	0	5.27	-11.25
Low Inc	50.00	25.31	41.37	6.68	34.21	-.47

BEST COPY

CAMBRIDGE

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the CAMBRIDGE Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR: Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
AGASSIZ						
Minority	13.58	-11.96	37.66	0.81	39.56	-2.35
Low Inc	23.35	-21.34	14.64	-30.06	0.00	0
M E FITZGERALD						
Minority	31.87	-.57	43.34	6.56	47.84	5.93
Low Inc	49.72	5.01	49.16	4.45	57.08	12.37
FLETCHER						
Minority	60.72	29.08	48.46	11.68	43.54	1.63
Low Inc	80.51	35.80	63.38	18.67	64.60	19.89
HAGGERTY						
Minority	18.62	-13.02	31.12	-5.66	43.86	1.95
Low Inc	51.59	6.88	67.40	22.69	59.54	14.93
CHARLES G HARRINGTON						
Minority	6.55	-25.09	17.66	-19.12	26.25	-15.66
Low Inc	72.72	28.81	81.96	37.25	81.94	37.23
KING						
Minority	53.13	21.49	45.98	9.12	47.81	5.90
Low Inc	60.41	15.70	58.59	13.88	52.19	7.48
(closed)						
Minority	18.63	-13.81	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	77.45	32.74	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	29.54	-2.10	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	50.33	5.62	0.00	0	0.00	0
LONGFELLOW						
Minority	41.28	9.64	32.15	-4.63	48.93	7.82
Low Inc	38.60	-6.10	48.57	3.86	43.67	-1.03
MORSE						
Minority	29.61	-2.83	46.79	10.01	46.97	5.06
Low Inc	39.38	-5.32	28.94	-15.76	51.65	6.94
PEABODY						
Minority	16.38	-15.26	39.08	2.30	48.56	6.65
Low Inc	7.74	-36.96	27.31	-17.39	19.95	-24.75
ROBERT F KENNEDY						
Minority	7.11	-24.53	25.82	-10.96	25.29	-16.62
Low Inc	9.13	-35.57	77.45	32.74	80.74	36.03
ROBERTS						
Minority	63.31	31.67	42.99	6.21	45.55	3.64
Low Inc	98.52	53.81	72.23	27.52	71.97	27.26
JOHN M TOBIN						
Minority	51.46	19.82	42.81	6.03	45.46	3.55
Low Inc	65.86	21.15	52.84	8.13	43.22	-1.48
(closed)						
Minority	54.80	23.16	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	60.40	15.69	0.00	0	0.00	0

BEST COPY

CAMBRIDGE

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the CAMBRIDGE Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
GRAHAM/PARKS NEW ALTERN						
Minority	43.22	11.58	44.73	7.95	47.73	5.82
Low Inc	25.13	-18.57	50.00	5.29	51.67	6.96
CAMB RINDGE + LATIN						
Minority	28.68	-2.96	35.91	-.87	41.31	-.60
Low Inc	19.73	-24.97	29.18	-15.52	28.00	-16.70

177 BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the CHELSEA Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
BURKE						
Minority	8.34	-18.58	15.46	-20.84	17.65	-28.26
Low Inc	67.42	9.78	72.15	14.51	70.42	12.78
PRATTVILLE						
Minority	3.72	-23.20	9.85	-27.45	12.84	-33.27
Low Inc	52.04	-5.59	58.26	0.62	55.75	-1.88
SHURTLEFF ELEM						
Minority	39.19	12.27	55.99	18.69	66.83	19.92
Low Inc	75.59	17.95	72.84	15.20	59.38	1.66
WILLIAMS ELEM						
Minority	42.89	16.97	57.58	20.20	52.99	16.68
Low Inc	74.92	17.29	73.84	16.20	82.98	25.34
WILLIAMS JR HIGH						
Minority	28.81	1.89	35.72	-1.58	44.75	-1.35
Low Inc	61.81	4.17	60.20	2.56	74.21	16.57
CHELSEA HIGH						
Minority	18.65	-8.27	27.53	-9.77	37.82	-9.09
Low Inc	38.43	-19.20	27.69	-29.94	40.13	-17.58

BEST COPY

FALL RIVER

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the FALL RIVER Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983

Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
ALDRICH						
Minority	0.39	-1.03	1.46	-.11	4.69	2.76
Low Inc	82.49	26.68	95.14	39.23	89.58	33.77
BELISLE						
Minority	3.31	1.89	1.76	0.19	2.95	1.32
Low Inc	59.43	3.62	53.21	-2.59	61.17	5.36
N.B.BORDEN						
Minority	3.53	2.11	4.50	2.93	3.15	1.22
Low Inc	82.35	26.54	75.84	20.03	59.18	13.37
BRAYTON AVENUE						
Minority	1.90	0.48	2.16	0.39	2.14	0.21
Low Inc	55.40	9.59	80.10	24.29	73.25	17.45
CARROLL						
Minority	1.05	-.37	1.86	0.39	1.87	-.06
Low Inc	52.08	-3.72	57.27	1.46	68.01	12.20
(closed)						
Minority	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	67.71	11.90	0.00	0	0.00	0
CONNELL						
Minority	1.82	0.40	2.14	0.57	2.72	0.79
Low Inc	84.84	29.03	38.23	32.42	91.84	36.02
COUGHLIN						
Minority	0.53	-.89	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	38.02	-17.78	45.45	-10.35	46.79	-9.01
DAVOL						
Minority	1.19	-.23	1.18	-.39	3.89	1.96
Low Inc	75.73	19.92	65.88	10.07	77.77	21.96
DORAN						
Minority	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	66.55	10.74	79.42	23.61	59.10	3.29
DORAN ANNEX						
Minority	0.46	-.96	2.37	0.80	0.60	-1.33
Low Inc	89.44	33.63	91.71	35.90	91.07	35.26
DUBUQUE						
Minority	1.76	0.34	1.44	-.13	0.00	-1.13
Low Inc	47.95	-7.85	57.53	1.74	72.90	16.99
FOWLER						
Minority	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	67.26	11.45	55.63	-.17	58.44	2.63
GREENE						
Minority	0.97	-.45	3.13	1.56	3.71	1.78
Low Inc	64.25	8.44	58.85	3.84	52.91	-2.89
SILVIA						
Minority	1.65	0.23	2.19	0.62	1.78	-.15
Low Inc	78.18	22.37	98.18	42.37	96.44	40.63

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
with the Averages for the FALL RIVER Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
HEALY						
Minority	4.70	3.28	9.31	7.74	5.95	4.82
Low Inc	55.70	9.89	69.76	13.95	61.39	5.57
HIGHLAND						
Minority	0.51	-.91	0.00	0	1.71	-.22
Low Inc	19.79	-36.01	30.00	-25.80	27.27	-28.53
LAUREL LAKE						
Minority	0.00	0	0.83	-.74	1.64	-.29
Low Inc	53.03	-2.77	58.82	2.21	65.98	10.17
LETOURNEAU						
Minority	0.71	-.71	0.82	-.75	1.32	-.61
Low Inc	21.12	-34.68	43.00	-12.72	43.66	-12.14
LINCOLN						
Minority	3.59	2.17	2.96	1.39	6.36	4.43
Low Inc	68.72	12.91	80.16	24.35	98.67	34.86
LINCOLN ANNEX						
Minority	6.82	4.60	5.31	2.74	5.16	3.23
Low Inc	84.58	28.77	94.69	38.88	82.47	26.66
OSBORN STREET						
Minority	1.12	-.30	2.93	1.36	3.96	2.83
Low Inc	80.44	24.63	78.94	23.13	82.48	26.67
PINE STREET						
Minority	0.00	0	1.21	-.36	1.24	-.69
Low Inc	53.33	-2.47	68.67	12.86	72.83	17.02
SLADE						
Minority	2.77	1.35	1.82	-.35	1.31	-.62
Low Inc	44.47	-11.33	55.89	0.88	59.93	4.12
SMALL						
Minority	2.57	1.15	6.83	4.46	4.18	2.17
Low Inc	64.83	9.02	76.95	21.14	75.76	19.95
SPENCER BORDEN						
Minority	0.92	-.50	1.80	-.57	0.66	-1.27
Low Inc	46.11	-9.69	43.55	-12.24	44.87	-11.73
STONE						
Minority	0.76	-.66	0.00	0	0.96	-1.07
Low Inc	67.66	11.85	62.30	6.49	61.53	5.72
TANSEY						
Minority	0.00	0	1.26	-.31	0.00	0
Low Inc	8.42	-47.38	5.91	-48.89	13.17	-42.63
WATSON						
Minority	0.39	-1.83	0.39	-1.18	0.00	0
Low Inc	45.88	-10.88	66.27	10.46	55.99	10.18
WESTALL						
Minority	3.41	1.99	4.33	2.78	2.17	0.24
Low Inc	68.56	12.75	77.29	21.58	72.43	16.62

BEST COPY

FALL RIVER

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the FALL RIVER Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
WILEY						
Minority	0.47	-.95	1.10	-.47	3.33	1.30
Low Inc	79.16	23.35	71.42	15.61	67.74	11.93
WIXON						
Minority	1.09	-.33	1.23	0.26	1.68	-.25
Low Inc	62.50	6.69	55.54	9.73	40.26	-15.54
EDMOND P. TALBOT MIDDLE						
Minority	4.25	2.83	1.05	-.52	1.50	-.43
Low Inc	60.27	4.46	65.08	9.27	72.60	16.79
HENRY LORD MIDDLE						
Minority	0.88	-.54	1.02	-.55	1.35	-.58
Low Inc	56.18	0.37	63.31	7.50	64.32	8.51
MORTON MIDDLE						
Minority	0.78	-.64	0.50	-1.07	1.45	-.48
Low Inc	39.47	-16.33	41.47	-14.33	42.18	-13.62
MATTHEW J KUSS MIDDLE						
Minority	1.46	0.04	1.20	-.37	2.80	0.87
Low Inc	45.43	-10.37	68.93	13.12	57.84	1.23
B M C DURFEE HIGH						
Minority	0.75	-.67	1.08	-.49	1.[illegible]	-.55
Low Inc	43.20	-12.60	35.84	-19.96	31.54	-24.36

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the HOLYOKE Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 5, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
HIGHLAND						
Minority	5.96	-20.47	51.43	13.69	55.76	14.17
Low Inc	23.31	-17.67	0.00	0	70.42	29.43
KIRKLAND						
Minority	3.94	-22.49	39.41	1.67	40.58	-.91
Low Inc	3.37	-37.61	0.00	0	52.54	11.55
MCMAHON						
Minority	2.06	-24.37	19.56	-18.18	25.44	-16.15
Low Inc	6.56	-34.32	45.73	4.74	52.36	11.37
METCALF						
Minority	3.00	-23.43	48.87	11.13	64.12	22.53
Low Inc	11.61	-29.37	56.56	15.57	70.73	29.74
MORGAN						
Minority	74.38	47.87	82.29	44.55	76.98	35.39
Low Inc	100.00	59.01	0.00	0	74.10	33.11
(closed)						
Minority	4.91	-21.52	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	21.56	-19.42	0.00	0	0.00	0
KELLY						
Minority	72.65	46.22	56.29	18.55	50.48	8.89
Low Inc	62.45	22.46	0.00	0	65.33	24.34
WHITE						
Minority	7.29	-19.14	24.74	-13.00	21.60	-19.99
Low Inc	4.36	-36.62	43.01	2.82	56.00	15.01
Holyoke						
Minority	37.58	11.15	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	96.53	55.54	0.00	0	0.00	0
SULLIVAN						
Minority	26.00	0.37	[illegible]	-10.58	43.06	1.47
Low Inc	62.43	21.44		0	45.50	4.51
DONAHUE						
Minority	8.82	-17.61	43.71	5.97	47.55	5.96
Low Inc	32.18	-8.80	76.77	35.78	80.32	39.33
PEDY						
Minority	21.82	-4.61	33.12	-4.62	39.49	-2.10
Low Inc	40.32	-.36	41.31	0.32	35.99	-5.89
LAWRENCE ELEM						
Minority	70.74	44.31	57.22	19.48	57.85	16.26
Low Inc	96.95	55.96	47.95	6.96	74.29	33.30
JOHN J LYNCH JR HIGH						
Minority	25.10	-1.33	31.87	-5.87	34.50	-7.09
Low Inc	40.40	-.59	34.54	-6.44	46.20	5.21
HOLYOKE HIGH						
Minority	15.87	-10.56	25.41	-11.33	30.04	-11.55
Low Inc	19.60	-21.38	20.54	-20.44	23.71	-17.27

BEST COPY

HOLYOKE

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the HOLYOKE Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983

Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
AM J DEAN VOC. TECH HIGH						
Minority	16.78	-9.65	19.75	-17.99	20.41	-21.18
Low Inc	26.77	-14.21	24.59	-16.39	28.57	-12.41

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the LAWRENCE Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hisoanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 5, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
ARLINGTON						
Minority	57.73	25.40	55.64	12.89	72.15	22.55
Low Inc	91.91	32.79	98.18	39.86	95.64	37.52
BREEN						
Minority	13.03	-19.30	25.29	-18.26	28.36	-20.24
Low Inc	53.64	-5.47	57.91	-1.20	48.38	-10.73
BRUCE						
Minority	24.91	-7.42	38.84	-4.71	44.51	-4.09
Low Inc	54.54	-4.57	45.60	-13.51	59.90	0.78
HENNESSEY						
Minority	68.98	36.65	71.66	28.11	69.03	28.43
Low Inc	84.24	25.12	71.42	12.30	75.55	16.43
(closed)						
Minority	7.96	-24.37	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	39.78	-19.33	0.00	0	0.00	0
J.P KANE SOUTH JR HIGH						
Minority	5.53	-26.80	16.90	-26.65	20.14	-28.46
Low Inc	32.54	-25.57	34.01	-25.10	39.93	-19.18
LAWLOR						
Minority	28.72	-3.61	57.64	24.09	56.89	8.29
Low Inc	72.38	13.18	83.69	24.57	76.88	17.76
LEAHY						
Minority	42.37	10.04	35.91	-7.64	65.35	16.75
Low Inc	75.76	16.64	69.49	10.37	78.47	19.35
JAMES F LEONARD						
Minority	84.48	52.15	79.87	36.32	70.95	22.35
Low Inc	98.72	39.60	90.37	31.25	75.31	16.19
OLIVER JR HIGH						
Minority	45.82	12.69	59.84	16.29	64.34	15.74
Low Inc	74.59	15.47	87.04	27.92	85.73	26.61
ROLLINS						
Minority	6.32	-26.81	18.54	-25.01	10.72	-37.88
Low Inc	48.69	-10.42	41.69	-17.42	46.68	-12.43
SAUNDERS						
Minority	5.80	-26.53	11.50	-32.85	9.39	-39.21
Low Inc	42.99	-16.12	31.03	-28.08	21.66	-37.45
(closed)						
Minority	5.56	-26.77	15.10	-28.45	0.00	0
Low Inc	27.38	-31.73	29.43	-29.68	0.00	0
TARBOX						
Minority	54.96	22.63	73.36	29.81	77.39	28.49
Low Inc	94.85	34.93	93.82	34.78	23.43	-35.68
WETHERBEE						
Minority	7.15	-25.18	21.04	-22.51	29.69	-18.91
Low Inc	41.25	-17.85	36.48	-22.63	49.47	-9.64

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the LAWRENCE Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 5, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1979-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
(closed)						
Minority	60.28	27.95	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	34.93	25.81	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	9.88	-22.45	16.67	-26.88	0.00	-0
Low Inc	58.21	-8.90	56.91	-2.20	0.00	0
LAWRENCE HIGH						
Minority	29.44	-2.89	46.03	2.48	47.16	-1.44
Low Inc	46.51	-12.60	31.23	-27.88	32.28	-26.83
(closed)						
Minority	45.46	13.13	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	100.00	40.88	0.00	0	0.00	0

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the LOWELL Public School System, 1979, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1979-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
OCONNELL						
Minority	9.55	-2.23	9.04	-7.26	14.82	-5.31
Low Inc	40.90	1.60	29.37	-9.92	27.57	-11.72
(closed)						
Minority	13.70	1.92	9.76	-6.54	0.00	0
Low Inc	78.08	38.78	92.68	53.38	0.00	0
COLBURN						
Minority	22.04	10.26	14.11	-2.19	11.77	-7.56
Low Inc	76.83	37.53	66.02	26.72	71.89	32.59
ROGERSGERS						
Minority	41.52	29.74	35.48	19.18	25.97	6.64
Low Inc	90.17	50.87	0.00	0	84.21	44.91
GREEN						
Minority	61.09	49.31	55.56	39.26	52.46	33.13
Low Inc	80.93	41.63	70.94	31.64	95.09	35.79
GREENHALGE						
Minority	4.86	-6.92	6.42	-9.88	19.92	0.59
Low Inc	42.07	2.77	43.45	4.15	63.07	23.77
PYNE						
Minority	0.40	-11.38	2.48	-13.82	0.40	-18.93
Low Inc	24.40	-14.89	23.76	-15.53	18.75	-20.54
LEE						
Minority	33.08	21.30	30.16	13.86	20.75	1.43
Low Inc	38.46	-.83	47.61	8.31	54.71	15.41
LINCOLN						
Minority	16.73	4.95	21.68	5.38	25.92	6.59
Low Inc	64.31	25.01	63.49	24.19	60.58	21.28
(closed)						
Minority	18.31	6.53	17.65	1.35	0.00	0
Low Inc	21.12	-18.17	23.52	-15.77	0.00	0
MOLLOY						
Minority	17.30	5.52	21.71	5.41	22.51	3.18
Low Inc	31.70	-7.59	45.60	6.30	47.57	8.27
MOREY						
Minority	2.41	-9.37	8.12	-8.18	12.20	-7.13
Low Inc	24.71	-14.58	7.33	-31.96	29.98	-9.31
LEBLANC						
Minority	8.24	-3.54	14.79	-1.51	15.99	-3.34
Low Inc	11.37	-27.92	23.34	-15.95	26.63	-12.66
PAWTUCKETVILLE MEM						
Minority	3.16	-8.62	24.76	8.46	28.37	9.04
Low Inc	38.76	-8.53	44.17	4.87	46.69	7.39
PINE STREET						
Minority	0.61	-11.17	4.73	-11.57	1.37	-17.96
Low Inc	13.84	-29.45	7.43	-31.86	8.90	-30.39

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the LOWELL Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
REILLY						
Minority	6.46	-5.32	10.12	-6.18	11.58	-7.75
Low Inc	27.20	-12.09	24.54	-14.75	22.79	-16.50
(closed)						
Minority	1.55	-10.23	0.60	-15.78	0.00	0
Low Inc	19.07	-20.22	9.58	-29.71	0.00	0
HENRY L ROBINSON						
Minority	6.10	-5.68	8.65	-7.63	10.91	-8.42
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
SHAUGHNESSY						
Minority	35.68	23.90	28.92	12.62	30.75	11.42
Low Inc	76.48	37.18	68.07	28.77	72.49	33.19
VARNUM						
Minority	9.44	-2.34	14.01	-2.29	17.77	-1.56
Low Inc	27.55	-11.74	27.45	-11.84	33.81	-5.43
WASHINGTON						
Minority	2.98	-8.80	22.50	6.20	33.08	13.75
Low Inc	14.85	-24.44	44.44	5.14	32.55	-6.74
ARTS SCHOOL						
Minority	0.00	0	24.42	8.12	37.81	18.48
Low Inc	0.00	0	25.82	-13.47	34.76	-4.53
CITY SCHOOL						
Minority	0.00	0	36.05	19.75	39.63	20.30
Low Inc	0.00	0	51.27	11.97	73.11	33.81
AMES						
Minority	18.96	7.18	19.11	2.81	14.95	-4.38
Low Inc	62.74	23.44	60.67	21.37	49.42	10.12
(closed)						
Minority	4.55	-7.23	16.13	-.17	0.00	0
Low Inc	36.36	-2.97	19.35	-19.94	0.00	0
BARTLETT JUNIOR HIGH						
Minority	20.43	8.65	29.68	13.38	37.50	18.17
Low Inc	71.10	31.80	70.89	31.59	80.85	40.75
BUTLER JUNIOR HIGH						
Minority	19.22	7.44	29.51	13.21	32.98	13.55
Low Inc	66.12	26.82	47.95	8.65	41.09	1.79
JAMES S DALEY JR HIGH						
Minority	2.47	-9.31	9.83	-6.47	16.78	-2.55
Low Inc	31.31	-7.98	32.45	-6.84	39.76	0.46
MOODY JUNIOR HIGH						
Minority	3.85	-7.93	7.12	-9.18	8.36	-10.97
Low Inc	13.60	-25.69	16.94	-22.35	14.40	-24.89
JOSEPH A MCAVINNUE						
Minority	0.18	-11.60	1.66	-14.64	2.44	-16.89
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the LOWELL Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3. ISR; Low Income from Table 6. ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
LOWELL HIGH						
Minority	8.98	-2.88	13.85	-3.25	16.37	-2.96
Low Inc	36.99	-2.38	34.36	-4.93	11.60	-27.63

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the LYNN Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983

Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
ABORN						
Minority	0.98	-9.41	2.78	-10.36	1.80	-13.45
Low Inc	16.54	-17.13	18.82	-14.85	13.66	-20.01
BREWICZ ELEM						
Minority	3.39	-7.00	9.85	-3.29	8.82	-6.43
Low Inc	44.61	10.93	31.56	-2.11	37.81	4.13
BRICKETT						
Minority	6.80	-3.59	8.84	-4.30	9.53	-5.72
Low Inc	45.40	11.72	47.67	13.99	52.91	19.23
(closed)						
Minority	2.66	-7.73	4.66	-8.48	0.00	0
Low Inc	21.59	-12.08	12.55	-21.12	0.00	0
CALLAHAN						
Minority	20.91	10.52	27.99	14.85	22.65	8.40
Low Inc	69.69	36.01	53.45	19.77	31.03	-2.64
COBBET						
Minority	13.53	3.26	19.07	5.93	26.50	11.25
Low Inc	49.96	16.18	60.20	26.52	57.50	23.82
CONNERY						
Minority	27.91	17.52	35.22	22.08	34.15	18.90
Low Inc	85.75	52.07	88.97	55.29	50.00	16.32
HARRINGTON						
Minority	34.88	24.49	38.95	25.81	48.84	33.59
Low Inc	65.12	31.44	53.01	19.33	48.83	15.15
HIGHLAND						
Minority	7.67	-2.72	8.41	-4.73	11.01	-4.24
Low Inc	55.55	21.87	50.00	16.32	50.00	16.32
HOOD						
Minority	7.75	-2.64	6.79	-6.35	9.41	-5.84
Low Inc	39.67	5.99	21.31	-12.36	19.63	-14.04
INGALLS						
Minority	20.00	9.61	24.27	11.13	37.35	22.10
Low Inc	73.54	39.86	59.96	25.28	65.25	31.58
(closed)						
Minority	2.11	-8.28	0.55	-12.59	0.00	0
Low Inc	24.89	-8.78	24.17	-9.50	0.00	0
LINCOLN						
Minority	3.68	-6.71	17.98	4.84	12.96	-2.29
Low Inc	21.63	-12.84	25.80	-7.87	25.38	-8.29
LYNN WOODS						
Minority	2.21	-8.18	1.49	-11.65	3.41	-11.84
Low Inc	7.48	-26.19	3.96	-29.71	5.11	-28.56
(closed)						
Minority	7.58	-2.81	8.03	-5.11	0.00	0
Low Inc	58.08	24.48	61.49	27.81	0.00	0

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the LYNN Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983

Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
SEWELL-ANDERSON						
Minority	0.92	-9.47	3.40	-9.74	2.02	-13.23
Low Inc	20.09	-13.58	6.31	-27.36	6.53	-27.14
SHOEMAKER						
Minority	2.77	-7.62	2.52	-10.62	6.44	-8.81
Low Inc	1.84	-31.83	1.25	-32.42	17.32	-16.35
SISSON						
Minority	2.53	-7.86	2.30	-10.94	2.12	-13.13
Low Inc	18.39	-15.28	5.08	-28.59	7.29	-26.38
TRACY						
Minority	1.65	-8.74	2.48	-10.66	4.50	-10.75
Low Inc	51.23	17.55	39.39	5.71	30.42	-3.25
WASHINGTON COMMUNITY						
Minority	66.13	55.74	51.68	38.54	43.89	28.64
Low Inc	73.46	39.78	95.97	62.29	49.52	15.84
BREED JUNIOR HIGH						
Minority	9.20	-1.19	13.25	0.11	14.01	-1.24
Low Inc	33.57	-.10	35.68	2.00	30.75	-2.92
(closed)						
Minority	23.25	12.86	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	67.18	33.50	0.00	0	0.00	0
EASTERN JR HIGH						
Minority	10.42	0.03	16.82	3.68	18.30	3.85
Low Inc	34.97	1.29	31.17	-2.50	33.46	1.78
PICKERING JUNIOR HIGH						
Minority	1.83	-8.56	1.52	-11.62	2.33	-12.92
Low Inc	11.76	-21.91	7.72	-25.95	11.41	-22.26
CLASSICAL HIGH						
Minority	12.37	1.98	12.59	-.55	14.76	-.49
Low Inc	19.95	-13.72	14.79	-18.88	11.06	-22.61
LYNN ENGLISH HIGH						
Minority	6.29	-4.10	9.06	-4.08	10.85	-4.40
Low Inc	6.99	-26.68	6.51	-27.16	6.72	-26.95
VOC TECH INSTITUTE						
Minority	4.93	-5.46	9.95	-3.19	11.28	-3.97
Low Inc	14.33	-19.34	41.65	7.97	55.01	21.33
(closed)						
Minority	5.84	-4.55	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	42.50	8.82	0.00	0	0.00	0

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the NEW BEDFORD Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983

Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
ASHLEY						
Minority	1.39	-17.21	1.27	-17.38	0.89	-19.29
Low Inc	34.33	-26.30	39.74	-20.89	39.52	-21.11
BROOKS						
Minority	37.21	18.61	26.11	7.54	25.23	6.85
Low Inc	66.11	5.47	65.40	4.76	67.54	6.90
CAMPBELL						
Minority	17.02	-1.58	30.44	11.87	29.40	9.22
Low Inc	62.15	1.51	77.71	17.07	84.14	23.50
CONDON						
Minority	5.00	-13.60	4.42	-14.15	4.45	-15.73
Low Inc	55.00	-5.63	9.87	-50.76	15.55	-45.08
CARNEY						
Minority	49.61	31.01	54.11	35.54	57.08	36.90
Low Inc	94.37	33.73	87.08	26.44	83.17	22.53
DEVALLES						
Minority	3.92	-14.68	2.75	-15.82	2.73	-17.45
Low Inc	79.92	18.18	75.68	15.04	79.31	18.67
DUNBAR						
Minority	14.46	-4.14	13.00	-5.57	17.18	-3.00
Low Inc	75.30	14.66	67.79	7.15	45.39	-15.24
GOMES						
Minority	44.59	25.99	42.78	24.21	42.74	22.56
Low Inc	92.72	32.08	93.90	33.26	91.88	31.24
HANNIGAN						
Minority	9.63	-8.97	10.53	-8.04	12.95	-7.23
Low Inc	86.00	25.36	68.18	7.54	74.34	13.70
HATHAWAY						
Minority	32.84	14.24	29.74	11.17	30.38	10.20
Low Inc	64.47	3.83	56.53	-4.10	65.18	4.54
HAYDEN/MCFADDEN						
Minority	12.36	-6.24	13.35	-5.22	18.73	-1.45
Low Inc	81.01	20.37	78.95	18.31	83.33	22.69
KEMPTON						
Minority	7.20	-11.40	16.13	-2.44	18.41	-1.77
Low Inc	48.92	-11.71	60.75	0.11	53.98	-6.65
LINCOLN						
Minority	2.62	-15.98	13.21	-5.36	5.11	-15.87
Low Inc	62.66	2.02	62.64	2.00	58.25	-2.38
MT PLEASANT						
Minority	25.13	6.53	25.68	7.11	30.00	9.82
Low Inc	76.38	15.74	82.77	22.13	83.05	22.41
OTTIWELL						
Minority	2.78	-15.82	2.98	-15.59	2.87	-17.31
Low Inc	67.72	7.08	31.94	-28.69	60.65	0.01

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the NEW BEDFORD Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
PARKER						
Minority	15.39	-3.21	15.31	-3.26	16.67	-3.51
Low Inc	68.00	8.16	74.28	13.64	63.60	2.96
PHILLIPS AVENUE						
Minority	0.00	0	2.33	-16.24	5.00	-15.18
Low Inc	80.38	19.74	73.95	13.31	71.00	10.36
PULASKI						
Minority	13.09	-5.51	8.00	-10.57	11.14	-9.04
Low Inc	47.19	-13.44	28.00	-32.55	31.09	-29.54
RODMAN						
Minority	32.67	14.07	34.52	15.95	29.70	9.52
Low Inc	61.38	8.66	54.42	-6.21	61.57	0.93
SWIFT						
Minority	2.54	-16.36	1.67	-16.90	6.10	-14.08
Low Inc	34.01	-26.62	23.33	-37.30	32.99	-27.64
TAYLOR						
Minority	0.68	-17.92	2.50	-16.07	1.79	-18.39
Low Inc	38.85	-21.78	39.64	-20.99	44.28	-16.35
WINSLOW						
Minority	7.50	-11.10	5.39	-13.18	2.39	-17.78
Low Inc	34.37	-26.26	24.07	-36.56	25.59	-35.04
KEITH JR HIGH						
Minority	24.07	5.47	29.29	10.72	28.61	8.43
Low Inc	60.50	-.13	56.66	-3.97	58.48	-2.15
NORMANDIN JR HIGH						
Minority	6.66	-11.94	7.75	-10.82	12.22	-7.96
Low Inc	60.36	-.27	54.97	-5.56	59.15	-1.47
ROOSEVELT JUNIOR HIGH						
Minority	21.50	2.90	16.20	-2.37	16.38	-3.80
Low Inc	35.78	-24.85	77.19	16.55	78.90	18.26
NEW BEDFORD HIGH						
Minority	22.26	3.66	20.94	2.37	24.32	4.14
Low Inc	40.89	-19.74	42.30	-18.33	32.50	-28.13

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the SPRINGFIELD Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
ARMORY						
Minority	51.03	5.57	50.19	-.89	52.10	-1.38
Low Inc	71.22	17.62	74.16	20.56	71.86	18.26
BALLIET						
Minority	41.23	-4.23	42.46	-7.82	45.95	-8.13
Low Inc	51.52	-2.87	48.42	-5.17	52.70	-.89
BOWLES						
Minority	51.47	6.81	57.64	7.36	57.60	3.52
Low Inc	59.59	5.99	58.15	4.55	65.60	12.00
BRIGHTWOOD						
Minority	87.03	41.57	87.62	37.34	90.27	36.19
Low Inc	92.41	38.81	95.79	42.19	89.78	36.18
BROOKINGS						
Minority	50.93	5.47	57.15	6.87	53.51	9.43
Low Inc	74.29	20.68	52.36	-.63	64.24	10.64
BRUNTON						
Minority	35.93	-9.53	41.29	-8.99	43.25	-10.83
Low Inc	25.25	-28.33	43.57	-10.82	41.00	-12.59
DEBERRY						
Minority	72.78	27.32	76.17	25.89	77.66	23.58
Low Inc	80.00	26.40	85.46	31.86	98.82	35.22
DORMAN						
Minority	52.46	7.00	52.19	1.91	58.95	4.88
Low Inc	54.90	1.30	52.53	-1.04	71.98	18.38
ELLS						
Minority	55.31	9.85	58.87	7.79	65.00	10.92
Low Inc	69.31	15.71	76.03	22.43	76.92	23.32
GLENWOOD						
Minority	57.55	12.09	62.89	12.61	73.42	19.34
Low Inc	67.03	13.43	73.00	19.40	84.68	31.08
GLICKMAN						
Minority	47.39	1.93	45.88	-4.40	52.37	-1.71
Low Inc	4.23	-49.36	43.95	-9.64	45.26	-8.33
FREEDMAN						
Minority	36.23	-9.23	33.14	-17.14	45.20	-8.88
Low Inc	34.49	-19.10	37.57	-16.82	52.66	-.93
HARRIS						
Minority	18.81	-26.65	24.76	-25.52	25.25	-28.82
Low Inc	29.70	-23.89	34.52	-19.07	31.05	-22.54
HOMER STREET						
Minority	59.43	13.97	63.81	13.53	63.13	9.35
Low Inc	47.12	-6.47	50.30	-3.29	75.56	22.96
HOWARD STREET						
Minority	64.42	18.96	73.84	23.56	80.20	25.92
Low Inc	96.06	42.46	94.76	41.16	90.00	36.40

BEST COPY

SPRINGFIELD

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the SPRINGFIELD Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978 School Percent	1978 Above/Below District %	1981 School Percent	1981 Above/Below District %	1983 School Percent	1983 Above/Below District %
INDIAN ORCHARD						
Minority	38.01	-7.45	37.75	-12.53	38.47	-15.61
Low Inc	65.75	12.16	62.25	8.65	56.57	2.97
KINSINGTON AVENUE						
Minority	25.74	-19.72	38.03	-12.25	43.37	-10.71
Low Inc	58.33	4.73	71.60	18.00	72.27	19.67
LIBERTY						
Minority	38.67	-6.79	37.91	-12.37	36.78	-17.30
Low Inc	61.86	7.46	60.13	6.53	67.09	13.49
LINCOLN						
Minority	95.90	40.44	91.28	41.00	91.18	37.10
Low Inc	97.43	43.83	96.51	42.91	97.11	43.51
MEMORIAL						
Minority	19.93	-25.53	17.73	-32.55	20.35	-33.83
Low Inc	39.88	-23.71	25.90	-27.69	34.29	-19.30
(closed)						
Minority	48.03	2.57	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	63.81	10.21	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	40.06	-5.40	43.90	-6.38	0.00	0
Low Inc	63.79	10.19	68.70	15.10	0.00	0
LYNCH						
Minority	37.98	-7.48	40.63	-9.65	35.34	-18.74
Low Inc	45.64	-7.95	21.87	-31.72	47.66	-5.93
POTTENGER						
Minority	50.10	4.64	55.64	5.36	59.14	5.86
Low Inc	62.15	8.55	65.83	12.23	57.16	3.56
(closed)						
Minority	87.50	42.04	71.43	21.15	0.00	0
Low Inc	100.00	46.40	80.95	27.35	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	51.67	6.21	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	70.00	16.40	0.00	0	0.00	0
SIXTEEN ACRES						
Minority	23.97	-21.49	30.29	-19.99	31.90	-22.29
Low Inc	3.27	-50.32	27.17	-26.42	34.42	-19.17
SUMNER AVENUE						
Minority	37.78	-7.68	43.46	-6.82	48.79	-5.29
Low Inc	56.17	2.57	46.49	-7.10	50.11	-3.48
TALMADGE						
Minority	30.29	-15.18	41.12	-9.15	43.19	-10.89
Low Inc	32.50	-21.89	38.48	-15.11	37.98	-15.61
(closed)						
Minority	56.82	10.56	95.35	45.07	0.00	0
Low Inc	49.37	-4.22	41.86	-11.73	0.00	0

BEST COPY

SPRINGFIELD

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the SPRINGFIELD Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
BEAL						
Minority	30.14	-15.32	24.89	-25.39	22.98	-31.10
Low Inc	40.26	-13.53	38.22	-15.37	33.18	-14.41
WARNER						
Minority	45.46	0.00	43.80	-6.48	46.86	-7.22
Low Inc	50.96	-2.63	54.93	1.33	54.71	1.11
WASHINGTON						
Minority	30.34	-15.12	30.64	-19.64	29.70	-24.38
Low Inc	39.49	-14.10	40.31	-13.28	38.74	-14.85
WHITE						
Minority	33.71	-11.75	42.90	-7.38	46.05	-8.03
Low Inc	56.17	2.57	65.78	12.18	65.39	11.79
NEW NORTH COMMUNITY						
Minority	63.34	17.88	65.45	15.17	68.74	14.66
Low Inc	65.38	11.78	65.04	11.44	71.51	17.91
PUPIL ADJUSTMENT CENTER						
Minority	50.00	4.54	57.90	7.62	67.95	13.87
Low Inc	98.00	44.40	100.00	46.40	100.00	46.40
CHESTNUT STREET JR HIGH						
Minority	84.91	39.45	91.25	40.97	87.89	33.81
Low Inc	85.89	32.29	87.58	33.98	79.59	25.99
JOHN J DUGGAN JR HIGH						
Minority	46.18	0.72	53.59	3.31	57.93	3.85
Low Inc	47.15	-6.44	49.61	-3.98	51.76	-1.83
FOREST PARK JR HIGH						
Minority	31.31	-14.15	32.59	-17.69	48.25	-5.83
Low Inc	53.87	0.27	62.00	8.40	60.38	6.78
JOHN F KENNEDY JR HIGH						
Minority	39.53	-5.93	51.08	0.80	56.71	2.63
Low Inc	52.42	-1.17	67.92	14.32	67.37	13.77
M MARCUS KILEY JR HIGH						
Minority	31.84	-13.62	33.42	-16.86	29.90	-24.18
Low Inc	36.56	-17.03	29.11	-24.48	34.62	-18.97
VAN SICKLE JR HIGH						
Minority	48.72	3.26	54.48	4.20	60.32	6.24
Low Inc	61.47	7.87	54.70	1.10	67.50	13.90
ALTERNATIVE JR HIGH						
Minority	26.67	-18.79	46.30	-3.98	76.28	22.20
Low Inc	70.00	16.40	88.88	35.28	94.74	31.14
CLASSICAL HIGH						
Minority	17.39	-28.07	24.65	-25.63	30.81	-23.27
Low Inc	14.19	-39.40	17.44	-36.15	16.50	-37.09
HIGH SCHOOL OF COMMERCE						
Minority	59.46	14.00	64.73	14.45	66.72	12.64
Low Inc	39.12	-14.47	48.34	-5.25	38.89	-14.70

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the SPRINGFIELD Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
TECHNICAL HIGH						
Minority	51.88	6.42	71.29	21.01	80.79	26.71
Low Inc	41.78	-11.81	43.27	-18.32	57.87	4.27
PUTNAM VOC TECH HIGH SCH						
Minority	33.20	-12.46	38.32	-11.96	42.69	-11.39
Low Inc	35.75	-17.84	31.09	-22.50	37.42	-16.17
(closed)						
Minority	50.20	4.54	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	79.75	25.15	0.00	0	0.00	0
SHRINERS HOSPITAL						
Minority	41.38	-4.08	30.77	-19.51	56.53	2.45
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
with the Averages for the WORCESTER Public School System, 1979, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1979-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1979		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
(closed)						
Minority	13.60	0.51	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	52.98	17.33	0.00	0	0.00	0
ADAMS STREET						
Minority	42.50	29.51	5.95	-11.83	9.68	-18.27
Low Inc	53.55	19.00	19.80	-16.75	44.44	7.89
BELMONT STREET COMMUNITY						
Minority	36.82	23.73	60.69	42.71	61.46	41.31
Low Inc	64.38	27.83	84.01	47.46	84.36	47.81
(closed)						
Minority	3.33	-9.16	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	3.92	-32.63	0.00	0	0.00	0
ARAGOUS ROAD						
Minority	0.87	-12.22	3.82	-13.96	4.27	-15.88
Low Inc	14.28	-22.27	14.22	-22.33	20.37	-16.18
(closed)						
Minority	36.20	22.91	1.00	-15.98	0.00	0
Low Inc	51.00	14.45	19.80	-16.75	0.00	0
BURNCOAT ST ELEM						
Minority	7.94	-5.15	29.14	12.16	43.65	23.50
Low Inc	17.77	-18.78	29.85	-6.70	49.51	12.36
CANTERBURY STREET						
Minority	5.77	-7.32	7.82	-9.95	31.91	11.76
Low Inc	68.73	32.18	68.92	32.37	77.38	40.83
CHANDLER ELEM COMMUNITY						
Minority	69.48	56.39	43.42	26.44	46.98	26.73
Low Inc	97.76	61.21	93.86	62.25	95.31	58.76
CLARK STREET COMMUNITY						
Minority	73.44	60.35	72.68	55.70	32.77	12.62
Low Inc	100.00	63.45	89.44	52.39	48.43	11.88
COLUMBUS PARK						
Minority	6.69	-6.40	23.17	6.19	33.04	12.89
Low Inc	32.62	-3.93	42.47	5.92	55.80	19.25
DARTMOUTH STREET						
Minority	2.38	-11.01	1.49	-15.49	12.24	-7.91
Low Inc	25.51	-11.04	28.37	-16.18	41.72	5.17
DOWNING STREET						
Minority	5.98	-7.11	10.26	-6.72	15.83	-5.12
Low Inc	44.77	8.22	31.70	15.15	54.92	18.37
FLAGG STREET						
Minority	3.51	-9.58	2.97	-14.01	3.55	-16.60
Low Inc	1.96	-34.59	1.85	-34.70	2.92	-33.63
ELM PARK COMMUNITY						
Minority	28.75	15.66	39.24	22.25	46.43	25.28
Low Inc	63.41	29.86	51.80	15.25	91.19	44.63

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the WORCESTER Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983

Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
FREELAND STREET						
Minority	5.89	-7.50	11.35	-5.63	11.60	-8.55
Low Inc	32.83	15.39	51.41	14.86	64.00	27.45
GATE STREET						
Minority	27.88	14.79	25.13	9.15	38.63	18.48
Low Inc	65.15	28.60	55.91	19.36	85.83	49.28
GATES LANDE						
Minority	1.87	-11.22	4.22	-12.76	3.26	-16.89
Low Inc	15.83	-20.72	25.28	-11.27	26.06	-10.49
(closed)						
Minority	1.79	-11.30	0.83	-16.15	0.00	0
Low Inc	9.53	-27.03	10.74	-25.81	0.00	0
GRAFTON STREET						
Minority	2.15	-10.94	8.06	-8.92	7.47	-13.68
Low Inc	86.69	50.14	84.74	48.19	87.13	50.58
GRANITE STREET						
Minority	1.20	-11.89	3.23	-13.75	7.94	-12.21
Low Inc	33.46	-3.09	27.41	-9.14	43.91	7.36
GREENDALE						
Minority	0.00	0	1.43	-15.55	1.15	-19.00
Low Inc	12.27	-24.28	14.00	-22.55	23.85	-12.70
HARLOW STREET						
Minority	5.16	-7.93	5.42	-11.56	33.90	13.75
Low Inc	49.82	13.27	54.15	17.60	69.49	32.94
HEARD STREET						
Minority	2.82	-11.07	2.65	-14.33	5.39	-14.76
Low Inc	5.36	-31.19	19.04	-17.51	25.14	-11.41
(closed)						
Minority	2.30	-10.79	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	4.59	-31.96	0.00	0	0.00	0
LAKE VIEW						
Minority	5.31	-7.78	4.14	-12.84	7.25	-12.90
Low Inc	11.42	-25.13	11.53	-24.90	24.63	-11.92
(closed)						
Minority	14.98	1.89	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	72.19	35.64	0.00	0	0.00	0
(closed)						
Minority	2.34	-10.75	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	3.50	-33.85	0.00	0	0.00	0
LINCOLN STREET						
Minority	3.81	-9.28	45.63	28.65	50.40	30.25
Low Inc	15.71	-20.84	47.44	10.89	72.26	35.71
NEW LUDLOW						
Minority	3.53	-9.40	3.35	-13.93	3.06	-17.39
Low Inc	18.40	-18.15	18.90	-17.65	16.79	-19.76

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the WORCESTER Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
(closed)						
Minority	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	31.36	-5.19	0.00	0	0.00	0
ASH STREET						
Minority	4.25	-8.84	3.87	-13.11	6.69	-13.46
Low Inc	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
MCGRATH ELEM						
Minority	5.00	-7.59	9.01	-7.97	10.31	-9.84
Low Inc	29.75	-6.79	30.86	-5.69	40.89	4.34
(closed)						
Minority	1.08	-12.01	0.00	0	0.00	0
Low Inc	11.82	-24.73	0.00	0	0.00	0
MIDLAND STREET						
Minority	0.00	0	4.27	-12.71	3.63	-16.52
Low Inc	4.46	-32.09	2.43	-34.12	13.40	-23.15
MILL BWAN						
Minority	14.38	1.29	27.28	10.30	16.57	-3.58
Low Inc	26.97	-9.68	42.78	6.83	39.87	3.32
MILLBURY STREET						
Minority	1.19	-11.91	6.48	-10.50	5.82	-14.33
Low Inc	51.17	14.52	53.52	16.97	70.34	33.79
NELSON PLACE						
Minority	4.17	-8.92	3.96	-13.02	4.92	-15.23
Low Inc	5.98	-30.57	4.15	-32.40	7.36	-29.19
NORBACK AVENUE						
Minority	5.77	-6.32	9.91	-7.07	12.64	-7.51
Low Inc	22.22	-14.33	20.29	-16.26	29.67	-6.88
QUINSIGAMOND						
Minority	7.45	-5.64	11.06	-5.92	14.20	-5.95
Low Inc	37.46	0.91	45.78	9.23	41.95	5.40
RICE SQUARE						
Minority	0.73	-12.36	2.82	-14.16	2.77	-17.38
Low Inc	13.07	-23.48	15.22	-21.33	22.61	-13.94
ROOSEVELT						
Minority	1.11	-11.98	1.13	-15.85	7.75	-12.40
Low Inc	22.89	-14.46	14.68	-21.87	25.16	-11.39
ST NICHOLAS AVE COMM SCH						
Minority	34.89	21.80	55.05	38.07	51.74	31.59
Low Inc	77.90	41.35	80.04	43.49	75.99	39.44
TATNUCK						
Minority	3.26	-9.83	9.22	-7.76	10.76	-9.39
Low Inc	7.69	-28.96	10.52	-26.03	23.30	-13.25
THORNDYKE ROAD						
Minority	2.91	-10.18	23.85	6.87	24.11	3.96
Low Inc	15.98	-20.57	22.51	-14.04	36.69	0.14

BEST COPY

Comparison of Minority Percentage and Low Income Percentage of Each School
With the Averages for the WORCESTER Public School System, 1978, 1981, 1983
*Minority = Black+Hispanic+Asian+American Indian from Table 3, ISR; Low Income from Table 6, ISR, Disadvantaged Students
The Low Income Percentage = the average of the averages for 1978-1983 to adjust for data reporting errors

School	1978		1981		1983	
	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %	School Percent	Above/Below District %
UNION HILL						
Minority	10.41	-8.58	10.29	-6.69	11.84	-8.31
Low Inc	75.79	39.24	85.64	49.09	65.15	48.60
(closed)						
Minority	1.46	-11.53	5.89	-11.09	0.00	0
Low Inc	36.44	-.11	29.41	-7.14	0.00	0
WEST TATNUCK						
Minority	4.89	-9.00	6.19	-10.79	7.84	-12.31
Low Inc	16.03	-20.52	12.71	-23.84	30.06	-16.49
WOODLAND ST COMMUNITY						
Minority	53.20	40.11	54.06	37.08	58.43	36.38
Low Inc	71.48	34.93	76.18	39.63	87.74	51.19
BURNCOAT STREET JR HIGH						
Minority	22.11	9.02	29.06	12.08	31.05	10.90
Low Inc	42.22	5.67	58.81	14.26	49.14	12.59
(closed)						
Minority	9.65	-3.44	14.27	-2.71	0.00	0
Low Inc	12.37	-24.19	26.90	-9.65	0.00	0
FOREST GROVE JR HIGH						
Minority	7.14	-5.95	8.41	-8.57	14.78	-5.37
Low Inc	20.69	-15.86	17.40	-19.15	22.74	-13.81
WORCESTER EAST MIDDLE						
Minority	13.83	0.74	14.29	-2.59	18.11	-2.04
Low Inc	48.01	11.46	52.08	15.53	46.31	9.76
SULLIVAN MIDDLE						
Minority	16.03	2.94	17.24	0.26	20.64	0.49
Low Inc	56.89	20.34	43.85	7.30	54.46	17.91
(closed)						
Minority	4.61	-8.48	8.04	-8.94	0.00	0
Low Inc	43.59	7.04	54.34	17.79	0.00	0
BURNCOAT SENIOR HIGH						
Minority	7.46	-5.63	13.91	-3.07	19.48	-.67
Low Inc	12.83	-23.72	22.98	-13.65	22.77	-13.78
DOHERTY MEMORIAL HIGH						
Minority	8.37	-4.72	14.04	-2.94	16.51	-3.64
Low Inc	11.78	-24.77	17.57	-18.98	11.79	-24.76
NORTH HIGH						
Minority	14.49	1.40	13.56	-3.42	13.77	-6.38
Low Inc	28.50	-8.85	47.42	10.87	28.51	-8.04
SOUTH HIGH COMMUNITY						
Minority	15.84	2.75	15.26	-1.72	17.85	-3.10
Low Inc	35.71	-10.84	36.55	8.10	25.75	-10.30

BEST COPY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We want to thank the following people for their cooperation in the preparation of these individual school profiles:

BOSTON

Superintendent Robert Spillane
- Dr. Catherine Ellison - Executive Director of Implementation
- Dr. Pamela A. Mason - Program Director, Elementary Reading/Language Arts
- Thomas P. Hennessey - Senior Advisor, High Schools
- Mary Grassa O'Neill - Senior Curriculum Advisor/Middle Schools
- Mary Russo - Program Director, Reading/Language Arts

Community Superintendents

- District II - Daniel Kearns
- District III - Joseph Ippolito
- District IV - Dr. Joyce Grant
- District V - Mildred Griffith
- District VI - Edward Sullivan
- District VII - John McGourty
- District IX - Roger Beattie

James J. Chittick School	- Rita K. Manning
Henry Grew School	- Amanda B. Amis
Dennis C. Haley School	- Robert Berry
Harvard-Kent School	- Joseph McCaffrey
Francis Parkman School	- Beatrice Wyatt
John Winthrop School	- Joseph T. Joyce
Washington Irving Middle School	- Michael Giunta
John W. McCormack Middle School	- Paul Falkowski
Dorchester High School	- Stanley Swartz Elizabeth Lynch
Jamaica Plain High School	- Stacy Johnson Marilyn Corsini
Boston High School	- William Lawrence Joseph Arangio
Hyde Park High School	- Michael Donato Lorraine Hamilton

CAMBRIDGE

Superintendent Robert Peterkin
- Mary Lou McGrath - Director of Elementary Education
- Dorothy S. Jones - Desegregation Director

Morse School	- James J. Coady
Fletcher School	- Marilyn A. McGinn
Peabody School	- Ron Walker

BEST COPY

HOLYOKE

Superintendent George Counter
Robert O'Neill - Desegregation Director
Felicitia M. El-Ghadi - Magnet Program Director

Kirtland School - Jeanne Sarkis
Donahue School - Nora Couch
Lawrence School - Alex Morelli

LOWELL

Superintendent Henry J. Mroz
George Tsapatsaris - Desegregation Director

City Magnet School - Robert J.Weintraub
Rogers Magnet School - Richard Noonan
Robert McLaughlin
Al Giumond

MEDFORD

Superintendent Raymond Murano
Roy E. Belson - Desegregation Director

Brooks/Hobbs School - Shirley Kountze

SPRINGFIELD

Superintendent Thomas Donahoe
Gary Roberts - Chapter 636 Evaluator

Warner School - Marcia Spaulding
Holmes School - Theodore Levine
Bowles School - Mary McGrath

WORCESTER

Superintendent John E. Durkin
Roland Charcentier - Desegregation Director

Burncoat School - Thomas Durkin
Canterbury Street School - Peter Trainor
Clark Street School - Francis Trainor

BEST COPY